

"The Socio-Economic Condition of Iran under the Il-Khans,"
by I. P. Petrushevsky, Chapter 6 from
Cambridge History of Iran (London, 1968),
Volume 5, pp. 483-537.

CHAPTER 6

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITION OF IRAN UNDER THE IL-KHĀNS

We can distinguish the following periods in the socio-economic history of Iran during the Mongol dominion.

The first period—from the twenties to the nineties of the thirteenth century—is marked by the colossal economic decline of Iran, caused both by the devastation wrought during the Mongol conquest, and still more by the administrative practices, in particular the taxation policy, of the first conquerors (the viceroys of the Great Khan, and then from 1256 the Il-Khāns). Typical phenomena of the time are a reduction in population and cultivated land, the decline of agriculture, the migration of fresh multitudes of Mongol and Turkish nomads, and the expansion of migrational cattle-breeding, a decline in urban life, the growth of tendencies of natural economy, an increase in state taxes and feudal rent, the attachment of peasants to the soil, and the growth of a peasant insurrectionary movement.

The second period—from the nineties of the thirteenth century to the middle thirties of the fourteenth century (to the death of Il-Khān Abū Sa'īd in November 1335) is characterized by something of an economic upsurge, especially in agriculture, as a result of the reforms of Ghazan. During this and the following periods conditional private ownership of land and large-scale unconditional landownership expanded at the expense of state and small-scale peasant landowning. The economy of the country did not however attain its pre-1220 level.

The third period extends from the mid-thirties to the eighties of the fourteenth century (to the beginning of Timur's conquest). This period is marked by feudal dismemberment, the struggle for power of feudal groups, and the political disintegration of the Il-Khānid state as a result. This disintegration began in 1336 and was completed in 1353 on the occasion of the killing of the last Il-Khān, Togha-Temür, and the destruction of his headquarters—*ordu*—in Gurgān by rebel Sarbadārs. The restoration of pre-Ghazan methods of peasant exploitation provoked violent rebellions among the peasantry (the Sarbadārs of Khurāsān in 1337-81, analogous movements in Māzandarān and Gilān

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

from the fifties to the seventies of the fourteenth century, and others), which were supported by minor Iranian landowners as well as urban artisans.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE MONGOL INVASION

In the Middle Ages invasions by conquering nomads of cultivated settled areas were normally devastating. The Saljuq conquest of Iran in particular was accompanied by pillage and destruction.¹ The destructive nature of the invasion of Khurāsān by the Oghuz of Balkh in the fifties of the twelfth century is notorious.² But the Mongol conquest brought to Iran as it did to other lands destruction and decline on an incomparably greater scale. This was because the conquests of Chingiz-Khān, uniting under his rule most of the Mongol, Turkish, and other nomads of Central Asia, were accompanied not by spontaneous cruelty, but by the systematic extermination of the civilian population in a series of towns (Balkh, Marv, Nishāpūr, Herāt, Ṭūs, Ray, Qazvīn, Hamadān, Marāgheh, Ardabil, etc.) and the laying waste of whole regions. This mass-killing was a complete system, put into practice on initiative from above, and had as its goal the planned destruction of those elements of the population that were capable of resistance, the intimidation of the remainder, and sometimes the providing of pasture for the nomads.

Ibn al-Athīr spoke of the Mongol invasion as of an enormous universal catastrophe.³ Even the pro-Mongol historian Juvainī, speaking of the massacres perpetrated by the generals of Chingiz-Khān, concludes with this assertion: "... where there had been a hundred thousand people there remained ... not a hundred souls alive."⁴ More than a century after the invasion, in 740-1339/40, the historian and geographer Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī refers to the "ruin (in the present day) as a result of the irruption of the Mongols and the general massacre of the people which took place in their days" and adds: "Further there can be no doubt that even if for a thousand years to come no evil befalls the country, yet will it not be possible completely to repair the damage, and bring back the land to the state in which it

¹ See, for example, Gurgānī, *Vis u Rāmīn*, pp. 23-4 (preface of the author concerning the destruction of the villages of the Isfahān oasis); Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-Nāma*, pp. 132, 134 (about the devastation of Shirāz).

² Ibn al-Athīr, vol. xi, pp. 117; Rāvandī, *Rābat al-sudār*, pp. 180 ff.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tornberg, vol. xii, pp. 233-5.

⁴ *Tārikh-i Jahān-Gus̄hā*, vol. i, p. 17; transl. J. A. Boyle, vol. i, p. 25.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE MONGOL INVASION

was formerly."¹ Such is the testimony of the contemporaries of the Mongol invasion.

Thus the economic and cultural decline of Iran after the conquest, as also of neighbouring lands, cannot be doubted. But we can only conceive the scale of the decline clearly if we collect and correlate the separate and varying pieces of information given by historians and geographers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and compare them with information from the pre-Mongol period.

The primary result of the Mongol conquest was a fall in population, mostly among the working people in town and country, due to massacre and abduction into slavery and captivity, the flight of the remaining population, and the desertion of areas that had been thickly populated at an earlier date. Arab and Persian sources, speaking of the universal slaughter in a series of towns and districts, give figures which stun the imagination. Thus at the taking of Nishāpūr, in 1220, 1,747,000 men alone are said to have been massacred.² At the capture of Marv, according to Ibn al-Athīr, about 700,000 people were killed,³ according to Juvainī, 1,300,000.⁴ At the second Mongol capture of Herāt, at the end of 1222, 1,600,000 people were said to have been killed.⁵ The number killed at the capture of Baghdad by Hülegü is fixed by Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī at 800,000.⁶ Describing massacres in the lesser towns, the sources give smaller figures: in Nasā 70,000 were killed;⁷ in the district of Baihaq (of which the chief town was Sabzavār) 70,000 dead were counted;⁸ 12,000 were killed in Tūn (Kūhistān),⁹ and so on.

Of course we cannot accept these figures as entirely reliable. Such sizeable numbers are difficult to accept for a population living in a feudal economy, even in the case of such major cities as Nishāpūr and others like it, and even assuming that the figures refer to the country

¹ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 27, transl. le Strange, p. 34.

² Saifī, *Ta'rikh-Nāma-ji Harāt*, p. 63. This figure is of course improbable.

³ Ibn al-Athīr, vol. xii, p. 257.

⁴ Juvainī, vol. i, p. 128. This figure is arrived at in an arbitrary manner by the author, who considers that the total ought to be 1,300,000, as the counting of the dead lasted thirteen days, and 100,000 corpses could be counted in a day and a night. See the English translation by J. A. Boyle, vol. i, p. 164.

⁵ Saifī, p. 60; similar figures are given by other sources. Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī informs us that there were 440,000 households in Herāt under the Ghūrids, that is 2,000,000 people, since household signifies family (*Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 152). According to Saifī (p. 67), 190,000 men took to arms in Herāt and district; if men fit for military service were 10 per cent of the population, we arrive at a figure of 1,900,000 souls for Herāt and district.

⁶ *Ta'rikh-i Guzida*, p. 580.

⁷ Nasawī, p. 52.

⁸ Juvainī, vol. i, p. 138; translation of J. A. Boyle, vol. i, p. 175.

⁹ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 54-5; Clavijo, edition of I. Sreznevsky, p. 187.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

districts surrounding the towns. But admitting exaggeration, we cannot however dismiss these figures as pure products of fantasy: the very fact that such numbers could be given, and in different sources, both pro- and anti-Mongol in orientation, implies a grandiose scale of mass-extinction, astounding the imagination of contemporaries. So does the fact that such towns as Ray were never rebuilt and remained uninhabited and in ruins for centuries. We should take into consideration also that many people were led away into slavery and captivity, or died of epidemics or hunger—the normal concomitants of foreign invasion.¹ Taking all this into account, we cannot doubt that between 1220 and 1258 the population of Iran declined several times over, the northern and eastern areas suffering most of all. Regrettably, the sources do not contain any overall figures for the population of Iran before and after the Mongol conquest.

Khurāsān suffered most of all. Yāqūt in the second decade of the thirteenth century speaks of the prosperity of the districts of Khurāsān.² According to Nasawi, all the towns and castles had been ruined and the major part of the population both in the towns and the rural areas either killed or carried off into slavery during the first Mongol invasion of Khurāsān in 1220–23, whilst the young men had been taken away for employment in siege operations; the conquerors left nobody in peace.³ Juvaini says that in a couple of months, Tolui so ravaged many regions of Khurāsān that he made them like the “palm of the hand”.⁴ Writing about the year 720/1321 Saifi cites the stories of old men, based on the memories of eye-witnesses, to show that at the time of the invasion there were in Khurāsān “neither people, nor corn, nor food, nor clothing”,⁵ and that “from the frontiers of Balkh as far as Dāmghān people ate only human flesh, dogs and cats for a whole year,⁶ because the warriors of Chingiz-Khān had burnt down all the granaries”.⁷

What life was like in the Herāt region of Khurāsān, one can judge from the stories of Saifi: after the slaughter of 1220 only sixteen

¹ According to a writer continuing the *Ta'rikh-i Sistān* (p. 396), about 100,000 died of famine and a disease of the legs, mouth and teeth (scurvy?) at the Mongol siege of Sistān (Zarang) in 632/1234–5.

² *Mu'jam al-buldān, passim* under the names of the towns and districts of Khurāsān; among other things are given the numbers of villages in districts. In the region of Tūs alone there were about 1,000 villages (*ibid.* vol. III, p. 560).

³ Nasawi, p. 52–4.

⁴ Juvaini, vol. I, p. 119; translation of J. A. Boyle, vol. I, p. 152.

⁵ Saifi, p. 83.

⁶ 618 = 1220–21.

⁷ Saifi, p. 87.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE MONGOL INVASION

people survived in the city of Herāt, and only forty, if we include fugitives from other places,¹ whilst not more than a hundred survivors remained in the surrounding countryside.² Saifi relates a vivid tale drawn from the memories of old men about the life of the forty chance survivors in their ruined and devastated city: first they fed upon the corpses of animals and men, then for a period of four years this handful of people were only able to get food by attacking passing caravans; and this too at distances of from 150 to 800 kilometres from Herāt.³ When in 1236 the Great Khan Ögedei gave assent to the rebuilding of Herāt and brought back some of the weavers (*jāma-bāfān*) who had been carried off into captivity, these latter had first of all to restore one of the canals that had been destroyed and then to harness themselves to the plough and sow corn, because there were neither peasants nor cattle in the countryside around the town.⁴

The Balkh region, according to Yāqūt,⁵ at the beginning of the thirteenth century before the Mongol conquest abounded in riches, producing silk and such a quantity of corn that it was the granary of the whole of Khurāsān and Khwārazm. From the life of the great Persian poet and mystic Jalāl al-Din Rūmī we learn that Balkh had about 200,000 inhabitants in the twelfth and at the beginning of the thirteenth centuries.⁶ The Mongols sacked it, massacring the whole population.⁷ Travellers who passed through Balkh, the Chinese Taoist Ch'ang-ch'un (1223),⁸ Marco Polo (the second half of the thirteenth century),⁹ and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (the thirties of the fourteenth century),¹⁰ inform us that it and its environs were derelict and deserted.

After the Marv oasis had been destroyed three times by the Mongols (1221–3), its agriculture and the dam on the river Murghāb were ruined, cattle had been driven away, and corn had been taken. Massacre followed massacre until "in the town and the villages there were not a hundred souls alive and not enough food even for these enfeebled few".¹¹ In Tūs only fifty houses remained occupied.¹² Nishāpūr was

¹ Saifi, p. 83.

² *Ibid.* pp. 182–3.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 89–90. For more detail see: I. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie i agrarnie otnoshenija v Irane XIII–XIV vv.*, pp. 67–69.

⁴ Saifi, pp. 110–11.

⁵ *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. I, p. 713.

⁶ Aflākī, vol. I, p. 15 (Huart's translation).

⁷ Juvainī, vol. I, pp. 103–5; transl. Boyle, vol. I, pp. 130–3.

⁸ Ch'ang-ch'un, p. 111.

⁹ Marco Polo, trans. Yule, vol. I, p. 158.

¹⁰ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, vol. III, p. 58.

¹¹ Juvainī, vol. I, pp. 125–32; transl. Boyle, vol. I, pp. 159–68.

¹² *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 238; transl. Boyle, vol. II, p. 501.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

completely empty and ruined after the wholesale slaughter;¹ in the town there was not a wall still standing and the rural area was also devastated.²

According to the poet Nizārī, many villages were still deserted in Kūhistān in the seventies, the town of Qā'in being still without water,³ 12,000 people had been killed in Tūn; all the Ismā'īlis in Kūhistān had been slaughtered in accordance with the decree of Hülegü.⁴

The Mongol conquest took an equally heavy toll in Tabaristān (Māzandarān). In the words of the historian of the region Ibn Isfandiyyār (beginning of the thirteenth century) "all land was cultivated from the mountains to the shores of the sea, and villages adjoined one another, so that there was not one span of waste land that did not bear the fruits of the earth";⁵ here "the whole countryside was garden or orchard, so that the eye saw nothing but green".⁶ Harvests were such that there were many fresh vegetables at each season of the year and a great quantity of corn, rice, millet, and every kind of meat and fowl;⁷ in the area "there had never been poverty, such as there was in other places".⁸ The same historian states that the region was desolate after the Mongol conquest and that throughout the whole of Khurāsān there were crowds of slave-captives from Tabaristān.⁹ The local historian Zahir al-Din Mar'ashī, writing about 1470, speaks of the terrible devastation of Māzandarān by the Mongols and says that the ruins and heaps of ashes were still there in his time.¹⁰ Yāqūt wrote of neighbouring Gurgān at the beginning of the thirteenth century as of a rich district, abundant in *garmst̄* (i.e. subtropical) crops and silk. As an example of the wealth of the region Yāqūt cites the case of an estate which cost 1,000,000 dirhams and was leased for 500,000.¹¹ But Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī speaks of the destruction of Gurgān by the Mongols, and says that in his time (1340) there were few people living there.¹² The decay of the irrigation network is referred to by Ghazan in his decree concerning the cultivation of desolate land.

¹ *Ibid.* vol. I, pp. 133-40; transl. Boyle, vol. I, pp. 169-78.

² *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. III, p. 230; vol. IV, p. 839.

³ Nizārī, *Kulliyāt*, manuscript in the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Tajik S.S.R. no. 100 (manuscript) of 972/1564-5), 1.292a.

⁴ Juvainī, vol. III, p. 277; transl. Boyle, vol. II, p. 724.

⁵ *Ta'rīkh-i Tabaristān*, ed. of Persian text of 'Abbās Iqbāl, vol. I, p. 74.

⁶ *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 76. ⁷ *Ibid.* ⁸ *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 81.

⁹ Ibn Isfandiyyār, *Ta'rīkh-i Tabaristān*, abridged English translation by Browne, GMS, p. 258.

¹⁰ Zahir al-Din Mar'ashī, p. 264.

¹¹ *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. I, p. 49.

¹² *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 159.

OTHER FACTORS IN THE DECLINE

OTHER FACTORS IN THE DECLINE

The dislocation in the life of Iran during the conquest was not however the only cause of the catastrophic decline in the economy of the country. There were other factors aggravating the decline. First of all, the conquest of Iran did not create a stable peace inside the land. The invasions of the armies of the Qipchaq and Chaghatai rulers, enemies of the Il-Khāns, were almost as destructive as the first Mongol invasion. We shall quote here only one example: in 1295 the Chaghatai ruler Du'a terribly ravaged and burnt the rural areas of Khurāsān (especially the Herāt oasis), the rural districts of Māzandarān, and the Yazd oasis, driving 200,000 prisoners (women and children) into servitude.¹ Equally devastating were the incursions of the Nigūdari Mongols, who led a nomadic existence in Afghanistan and did not recognize the authority of the Il-Khāns,² into Khurāsān, Sistān, Kirmān and Fārs,³ and the punitive expeditions of the Il-Khāns themselves against their recalcitrant vassals, or in order to put down popular revolt (for example the revolt in Fārs led by the *qādī* Sharaf al-Din, who proclaimed himself Mahdi in 663/1265).⁴ It is sufficient to say that Khurāsān remained desolate;⁵ the Herāt oasis and Herāt itself were devastated with the loss of part of the population in 1270, 1288, 1289, 1295, 1306–07 and 1319.⁶

The increase in the number of nomads in the country had a part in the decline of the economy, especially that of agriculture. Contrary to the opinion of V. V. Barthold that “the Mongol invasion was not connected, as was the Germanic invasion of the Roman Empire, with transmigration of people”,⁷ the sources permit us to speak of a considerable migration of Mongol nomadic tribes into the territory of the Il-Khāns,⁸ not to mention that of Turkish nomads. Some previously agricultural territory became pasture for the nomads, as for example Bādgīs in Khurāsān, where before the Mongol conquest there were

¹ Saifi, pp. 402, 408, 416.

² Ancestors of the present-day Hazāra Mongols in Afghanistan.

³ Vaṣṣaf, pp. 199–202; Saifi, pp. 379–83; for details see Marco Polo, trans. Yule, vol. I, pp. 99–100.

⁴ Vaṣṣaf, pp. 191–92.

⁵ Saifi, p. 346 (under the year 975 or 1276).

⁶ Saifi, pp. 379 ff., 381 ff., 402 ff., 461 ff., 503 ff., 716 ff. For details see: I. Petrushevsky, *Trud Saifi kak istochnik po istorii Vostochnogo Khorasanu*.

⁷ *Istoria kud' turnoi zhibzni Turkestana*, p. 86.

⁸ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 64, 66, 83, 85; *Shabāngārāj*, ff. 228a, 237b; *Mukātibāt-i Rāshidī*, pp. 273–8 (no. 46; Marco Polo, trans. Yule, vol. I, pp. 99–100); Evliya Chelebi, *Siyāḥat-Nāma*, vol. II, pp. 291 ff.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

several towns with populations of 20,000–30,000.¹ The influence of the nomads proved unfavourable to Iran in the economic sphere. Nomadic cattle-rearing, without knowledge of fodder-grass cultivation and based upon cattle being at grass the whole year round, was extensive in character and required great uninhabited expanses of summer and winter pasture. The nomads, always armed and strong by reason of their tribal organization, ruined grass and trampled crops underfoot in their migrations, not scrupling to rob unorganized, unarmed, and defenceless peasants.² But the political rule of the nomads or, more exactly, of their feudal military aristocracy, who regarded the subjugated Persians as a permanent source of plunder and revenue and no more, also created great difficulties for Iran. Because, although nomad cattle-breeding was known in Iran from ancient times,³ it had never occupied as important a position in the economy, as it did under the Mongols and later. Neither under the Umayyads, nor even under the Saljuqs did the military nobility of nomad tribes play such a leading role, as it did under the Īl-Khāns and their successors, the Jalayirids, Qara-Qoyunlu, Aq-Qoyunlu, and the first Šafavids.

The most important factor hindering the economic renaissance of the country and contributing to further economic decline was the fiscal policy of the viceroys of the Great Khan, and of the Īl-Khāns. This policy was particularly hard on peasant farmers, since the taxes were not precisely established, were levied in an arbitrary manner,⁴ were collected several times over,⁵ and were often of arbitrary size. We shall speak later in greater detail about the fiscal system of the Īl-Khāns. Let us for the time being note that towards the end of the thirteenth century the peasants had been brought to the verge of poverty and mass-flight. Thus even those regions which had not fallen prey to the invasion of Chingiz-Khān and Hülegü, as for example Fārs, were ruined. Vaşṣāf gives a typical example of the decline of agricultural productivity in the Fārs region. The district of Kurbāl, considered one of the most fertile, watered by canals from the river Kur, on which were two large dams (the Band-i Amir and Band-i Qaşşār),⁶ yielded about

¹ Hāfiẓ-i Abrū, geographic works, f. 228a.

² *Mukāribāt-i Rašīdī*, pp. 177 (no. 33), 277–8 (no. 46); *Dastūr al-kātib*, ff. 34a, 224b, 233b, etc.

³ Herodotus, *History*, Book 1, chapter 125.

⁴ See Juvainī, vol. II, pp. 244, 261, 269, 274, 277–8; trans. Boyle, vol. II, pp. 508, 524, 533, 539, 541–3.

⁵ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 453.

⁶ Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fārs-Nāma*, pp. 151–2; *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 124.

OTHER FACTORS IN THE DECLINE

700,000 *kharvārs* (ass-loads)¹ of grain in the annual harvest under Büyid 'Aḍud al-Daula (949–83). Under the atabeg Sa'd b. Abī Bakr, a vassal of the Īl-Khāns, the annual harvest there about the year 1260 fell to 300,000 *kharvārs*, and before the reforms of Ghazan fell even further, and the *kharāj* of Kurbāl consisted of only 42,000 *kharvārs* of grain.² The deliveries of grain from the other districts of Fārs decreased in a like manner.³

Rashid al-Dīn gives the following general characterization of the decline of Iran and neighbouring countries before the reforms of Ghazan:

At the time of the Mongol conquest they submitted the inhabitants of great populous cities and broad provinces to such massacres, that hardly anyone was left alive, as was the case in Balkh, Shuburqān, Tāliqān, Marv, Sarakhs, Herāt, Turkestan, Ray, Hamadān, Qum, Iṣfahān, Marāgheh, Ardabil, Barda'a, Ganjah, Baghdad, Irbil and the greater part of the territories belonging to these cities. In some areas on the frontiers, frequently traversed by armies, the native population was either completely annihilated or had fled, leaving their land waste, as in the case of Uighuristān and other regions that now formed the boundary between the *ulus* of the Qa'an and Qaidu. So also were several districts between Darband and Shīrvān and parts of Abulustān and Diyārbakr, such as Harrān, Ruha,⁴ Sarūj, Raqqa and the majority of cities on both sides of the Euphrates, which were all devastated and deserted. And one cannot describe the extent of the land laid waste in other regions as a result of the slaughter, such as the despoiled lands of Baghdad and Āzarbāijān or the ruined towns and villages of Turkestan, Iran and Rūm [Asia Minor], which people see with their own eyes. A general comparison shows that not a tenth part of the lands is under cultivation and that all the remainder is still lying waste.⁵

TENDENCIES IN THE SOCIAL POLICY OF THE ĪL-KHĀNS

We can trace two political trends in the upper strata of the Mongol victors and the leading group of Iranian aristocracy allied to them. The supporters of the first trend, admirers of Mongol tradition and the nomadic way of life, were antagonistic to a settled life, to agriculture

¹ Conventional measure of weight; 1 *kharvār* = 100 *mans*, but the *man* varied in different districts; Shīrvān *man* = 3·3 kg, Tabrīz *man* = app. 3 kg.

² Vassaf, p. 445. Taking the *kharāj* to be 20–24 per cent of the crop, the overall crop can be estimated at from 221,000 to 175,000 *kharvārs*. See calculations in: I. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie . . .*, pp. 81–2; also reference to sources.

³ Vassaf, p. 445; see *ibid.* p. 435.

⁴ The ancient Edessa, now called Urfa.

⁵ Jāmi' al-tawāriķ, ed. Alizade, pp. 557–8.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

and to towns,¹ and were supporters of unlimited, rapacious exploitation of settled peasants and town-dwellers. These representatives of the military feudal-tribal steppe aristocracy regarded themselves as a military encampment in enemy country, and made no great distinction between unsubjugated and subjugated settled peoples. The conquerors wished to plunder both, albeit in different ways, the former by seizure of the spoils of war, the latter by exacting burdensome taxes. The supporters of this policy did not care if they ended by ruining the peasantry and the townspeople; they were not interested in their preservation. The most self-seeking and avaricious members of the local Iranian bureaucracy supported the adherents of this first trend,² as did the tax-farmers, who closely linked their interest to that of the conquerors and joined with them in the plunder of the settled population subject to taxation—the *ra'iyyat*.

As well as being supported by a small group of nomad aristocrats, closely connected by service with the family of the Īl-Khān in his headquarters (*ordu*) and demesne (*injū*), the second trend was mainly supported by the majority in the Iranian bureaucracy, by many of the Muslim clergy,³ and by the large-scale merchants. This tendency aimed at the creation of a strong central authority in the person of the Īl-Khān, the adoption by the Mongol state of the old Iranian traditions of a centralized feudal form of government, and in connexion with this the curbing of the centrifugal proclivities of the nomad tribal aristocracy. To do this it seemed necessary to reconcile the feudal leaders of Iran to the Īl-Khān, to reconstruct the disrupted economy of the country, particularly of agriculture, and to foster town-life, trade, and the merchants. Some lightening of the fiscal burden, an exact stabilizing of imposts and obligations (there was no stability in these under the first Īl-Khāns) laid upon the *ra'iyyat*, and protection from such taxes and services as would ruin them completely, were necessary conditions of this.⁴ The conflict between these two tendencies is complicated by the

¹ The Yasa of Chingiz-Khān required the Mongols to lead a nomadic existence, not to settle nor to dwell in the towns: see the *Ta'rikh-i Guzida*, manuscript in Leningrad State University, no. 153, 472 (not in edition of E. G. Browne); quotation in W. Barthold, *Turkestan*, G.M.S. N.S. (London, 1958), p. 461 n. 5.

² Such were the great *bitikebi* Sharaf al-Dīn Juvainī, the *sāhib-diwan* Shams al-Dīn Muhammād Juvainī (the brother of the historian), and particularly his son Bahā' al-Dīn Juvainī.

³ Under the first Īl-Khāns Christians also (mostly of the Nestorian and Monophysite clergy).

⁴ For more about these two trends see: I. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie i agrarnie otnosheniya v Irane v XII-XIV vv.*, pp. 46-53; there are also references to sources and literature for research.

TENDENCIES IN THE SOCIAL POLICY OF THE İL-KHĀNS
conflict between the pristine trends of the Iranian Middle Ages, towards
feudal disintegration and feudal centralization.

A policy in the spirit of the first tendency predominated under the first six İl-Khāns. For this reason, although there was no lack of attempts by individual rulers to rebuild cities and irrigation networks, nevertheless these attempts were not successful, because of the policy of unbounded exploitation of the *ra'iyyat*—both peasant and city-dweller. Since the work of construction was carried out by unpaid forced labour, it only laid an extra burden upon the *ra'iyyat*, who were ruined previous to this, and in general such work was not completed.¹

The second trend gained the upper hand in the *ulus* of the İl-Khāns during the reign of Ghazan, from 1295 to 1304. His vizier, the historian, Shafi'ite theologian and encyclopaedist Rashid al-Din Faḍl Allāh Hamādānī (1247–1318), who carried out the reforms of this İl-Khān, was the most notable representative and ideologist of this policy. After the publication of the correspondence of Rashid al-Din, we cannot doubt but that his was the initiative in the reforms of Ghazan. In a letter to his son Shihāb al-Din, governor of Khūzistān, Rashid al-Din expressed in the following words the idea that it was necessary to keep the well-being of the *ra'iyyat* up to a certain level, since they were the fundamental payers of taxes:

It is fitting that rulers have three exchequers; firstly of money; secondly of weapons; thirdly of food and clothing. And these exchequers are named the exchequers of expenditure. But the exchequer of income is the *ra'iyyat* themselves, since the treasuries that I have mentioned are filled by their good efforts and their economies. And if they are ruined, the king will have no revenue. After all, if you look into the matter, the basis of administration is justice, for if, as they say, the revenue of the ruler is from the army, and the government (*saltanat*) has no revenue but that paid by the army,² yet an army is created by means of taxation (*māl*), and there is no army without taxation. Now tax is paid by the *ra'iyyat*, there being no tax that is not paid by the *ra'iyyat*. And the *ra'iyyat* are preserved by justice. There are no *ra'iyyat*, if there is no justice.³

This same idea is expressed by Ghazan in a speech made to amirs, i.e. to the Mongol-Turkish military and nomad aristocracy. In this speech he says amongst other things:

¹ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 558; cf. Saifi, pp. 440, 444.

² That is, out of plunder, one-fifth of which went to the state.

³ *Mukātabāt-i Rashidi*, pp. 118–19 (no. 22).

IRAN UNDER THE İL-KHĀNS

I am not on the side of the Tāzik¹ *ra'iyyat*. If there is a purpose in pillaging them all, there is no-one with more power to do this than I. Let us rob them together. But if you wish to be certain of collecting grain (*tagbār*)² and food (*āsh*) for your tables in the future, I must be harsh with you. You must be taught reason. If you insult the *ra'iyyat*, take their oxen and seed, and trample their crops into the ground, what will you do in the future? . . . The obedient *ra'iyyat* must be distinguished from the *ra'iyyat* who are our enemies.³ How should we not protect the obedient, allowing them to suffer distress and torment at our hands.⁴

GHAZAN'S REFORMS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

The most important of Ghazan's reforms aimed at restoring the Iranian economy were: a new method of levying the land tax (*kharāj*) and other taxes payable to the dīvān, fixing a precise sum for each particular area in money or kind to be paid twice yearly, in spring and autumn;⁵ the cutting by half of the impost on trades and crafts (*tamgha*)⁶ in some towns and its complete abolition in others;⁷ this measure was intended to assist the revival of town life. Other reforms important for the Iranian economy were enacted during the reign of Ghazan:⁸ the abolition of *barāt*, i.e. the system of payment of state liabilities to soldiers, officials, pensioners, and creditors of the state by means of notes drawn against local exchequers, transferring payment on them to peasants, on whose shoulders was thus laid an additional fiscal burden; abolition of the practice of quartering military and official personnel in the homes of the *ra'iyyat*, which practice, accompanied always by extortion and maltreatment of the taxable population, was one of the heaviest

¹ I.e. Tajik; this term was then used to describe Iranians in general; see W. Barthold's article, "Tādjik", *EI*.

² I.e. payment in kind of the military personnel of the state out of taxes.

³ I.e. rebels.

⁴ Probably this manifesto of Ghazan to the amīrs was inspired by Rashid al-Dīn, if not written by him and ascribed by him to his master. The same speech in a somewhat varying form is in the Jalayirid collection of official documents *Dastūr al-kātib* (f. 34a-b); we find it in another slightly varied form in the "Introduction" to the Persian tract on agriculture *Irshad al-zirā'a* of the year 915/1509-10; the text and the Russian translation of the latter (from the manuscript of E. M. Peshchereva, Leningrad; in the lithographed edition of 'Abd al-Ghaffār, 1323/1905-6, the "Introduction" is omitted) are to be found in: I. Petrushevsky, *Zemliedel'ye . . .*, pp. 57-8.

⁵ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 478.

⁶ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, vol. 111, pp. 466-77; a copy of a new tax-roll for Khūzistān is cited in the *Mukātabāt-i Rashidī*, pp. 122-3 (no. 22).

⁷ See the *Mukātabāt-i Rashidī*, pp. 32-4 (no. 13), 122-3 (no. 22).

⁸ Copies or descriptions of Ghazan's decrees are to be found in *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*.

GHAZAN'S REFORMS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

impositions upon them; limitation of carriage and postal services, which were a heavy burden; the decree permitting the settlement and cultivation of deserted and neglected land belonging to the Divān and private owners, together with the creation of fiscal incentives; the restoration of the currency and the establishment of a firm rate for silver coin: 1 silver dinār, containing 3 mithqāls of silver = 13·6 grammes = 6 dirhams: the establishment of a single system of weights and measures (using the Tabriz system) for the whole state. It is true that even after these measures taxes were still quite high.¹ But in comparison with the previous system of pure club-law and unrestricted pillage, the new regime was an improvement from the point of view of the ra'iyyat. The decrees of Ghazan, forbidding the use of violence by amirs, their households, servants of the khan, messengers, officials and nomads against the ra'iyyat also played a part in this development. Ghazan also enacted wide-ranging measures for the restoration of the ruined irrigation network² and for the revival of agriculture.³

The reforms of Ghazan and the temporary transfer of a leading political role in the State from the nomad Mongol-Turkish aristocracy to the Iranian civil bureaucracy made some economic improvement possible, especially in agriculture. Rashid al-Din evidently exaggerated the importance of Ghazan's reforms: Vaṣṣāf speaks of them in a more modest manner. Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī however witnesses to the revival of agriculture in his factual description of the state of agriculture in a series of regions: he speaks of rich harvests, low prices, an abundance of foodstuffs, the export of corn and fruit, and so on.⁴ The effect of Ghazan's reforms was still felt during the reign of his brother Öljeitü (1304–16), when control of affairs remained in the hands of Rashid al-Din. The information that we are given concerning the social policy of Abū Sa'īd (1316–35) is contradictory. Vaṣṣāf speaks of fresh fiscal oppression and of the arbitrary abuse of power by financial officials about the year 718/1318.⁵ Fifteenth-century writers like Zahir al-Dīn Mar'ašī and Daulatshāh, on the other hand, describe Abū Sa'īd as a most ra'iyyat-loving ruler, under whom the country flourished.⁶ These pieces of information probably contradict one another because they

¹ See below for more on this point.

² *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 411–12; *Mukātibāt-i Rashidī*, pp. 157–58 (no. 28), 180–1 (no. 33), 245–7 (no. 38, 39); *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 208–28.

³ *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, p. 415.

⁴ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 49–55, 59, 71–89, 109–12, 147–58; see also the description of Khurāsān in the geographical work of Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū.

⁵ Vaṣṣāf, pp. 630 ff.

⁶ Zahir al-Dīn Mar'ašī, pp. 101–2; Daulatshāh, pp. 227–8.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

refer to different periods—either to the beginning of Abū Sa‘id’s reign, when the influence of the nomadic military aristocracy again predominated under the amīr and favourite Choban, or to the end of his reign, when the vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad Rashidī, the son of Rashid al-Dīn, reintroduced his father’s policy.

After the death of Abū Sa‘id civil wars between feudal cliques (connected with the development of a system of military feoffs)¹ the political disintegration of Iran and the inclination of certain local dynasties to use pre-Ghazan methods of government put an end to further economic revival. If the earlier Jalayirids (Ḥasan-i Buzurg, 1340–56, and Shaikh Uvais, 1356–74) had attempted to rule in the spirit of Ghazan,² the Chobanids, having established themselves in Āzarbājān and Persian ‘Irāq (1336–56) and basing their power exclusively on the Mongol-Turkish nomad aristocracy, resurrected the system of unrestricted and unregulated force and the unrestrained pillage of the *ra‘iyat*. This distinction between the policies of the two dynasties is made by the author of *Ta’rikh-i Shaikh Uvais* in a story in which he relates the following: At the gates of Baghdad, before a battle, the amīrs of the Jalayirid army said to the amīrs of the Chobanid forces: “You are tyrants, but when we left you Āzarbājān it was like Paradise, and we have made Baghdad into a flourishing city”; the Chobanid amīrs answered: “We were in Rūm and wrought havoc; you made Āzarbājān flourish, we drove you from it, and ravaged the country as we did before; now we have come here and shall drive you out and ruin this region also.”³

In spite of a certain revival at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries, the economy had far from reached its pre-conquest level. We can deduce this if we compare the numbers of villages in various regions (*vilāyat*) before and after the Mongol conquest.

In the *vilāyat* of Herāt there were about 400 villages in the tenth century,⁴ at the beginning of the fifteenth 167.⁵ In the *vilāyat* of Isfahān alone the number had increased.⁶

¹ See below.

² *Dastūr al-kāib*, passim, especially ff. 36b–37a, 47b–48b, 51a–51b.

³ *Tārikh-i Shaikh Uvais*, ed. J. B. van Loon, facsimile, f. 173; cf. Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Dhail-i Jāmi‘ at-tawārikh*, ed. Bayāni, pp. 171–85.

⁴ Ibn Rusta, *B.G.A.*, vol. vii, p. 173.

⁵ Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, Geographical Works, manuscript quoted, ff. 225a–227b (list of villages).

⁶ According to Yāqūt (f. 292)—360 villages; according to *Nuzhat al-qulūb* (p. 50)—400 villages, not including hamlets; according to the *Tarjuma-yi Maḥāsin-i Isfahān*, p. 47 (in 1329)—800 villages (*dīb*) and hamlets (*mazra‘a*).

GHAZAN'S REFORMS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

Vilāyat	Yāqūt (early thirteenth century) ^a	Ḩamd Allāh Qazvīnī (approx. 1340) ^b	Ḩāfiẓ-i Abrū (early fifteenth century) ^c
Hamadān	660 villages	212 villages	—
Rūdhārvār	93 villages	73 villages	—
Khwāf	200 villages	—	30 villages (<i>qarya</i>), excluding hamlets (<i>mazra'a</i>)
Isfara'in	451 villages	50 villages	26 villages, excluding hamlets
Baihaq ^d	321 villages	40 villages	84 villages, excluding hamlets
Juvain	189 villages	—	29 villages, etc.
Turshīz (Bush̄t)	226 villages	—	20 villages, etc.

^a *Mu'jam al-buldan*, respectively: vol. iv, p. 988; vol. i, p. 246; vol. ii, pp. 911, 486; vol. i, p. 804; vol. ii, p. 165; vol. i, p. 628.

^b *Nuzhat al-qulub*, respectively: pp. 72, 73, 149.

^c Geographical Works, quoted manuscript, ff. 251a, 229b, 231a-233a.

^d According to the *Tārikh-i Baihaq* of Ibn Funduq (approx. 1168), p. 34—395 villages.

Ḩamd Allāh Qazvīnī names more than thirty towns that were still in ruins in his time, among them Ray, *Khurramābād*, Saimara, Tavvaj, Arrajān, Dārābjird and Marv. According to the same author some cities had become small towns, such as Qum and Sirāf. A series of former towns had become villages such as Ḥulwān, Miāneh, Barzand, Kirmānshāh and Kirind.¹

We can judge the condition of Iran's economy in the Il-Khānid period from the tax-returns received by the dīvān of the central government. According to Vaṣṣāf, previous to the reign of Ghazan the dīvān received each year 18,000,000 dinārs,² according to Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī the sum was 17,000,000, whilst after Ghazan's reforms the figure rose to 21,000,000 dinārs;³ but in 1335–40 the sum was 19,203,800.⁴ It is interesting to compare these figures with the returns of the Saljuq period (in Il-Khānid dinārs) also quoted by Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī in his work,⁵ as well as with the figures given in the *Risāla-yi Falakiyya*.⁶

¹ *Nuzhat al-qulub*, *passim* (see index).

² Vaṣṣāf, p. 271.

³ *Nuzhat al-qulub*, p. 27.

⁴ These calculations were made by adding the figures given for separate districts in the *Nuzhat al-qulub*.

⁵ As an important official of the finance department, Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī had access to the account-books of this department and had seen the overall roll composed by his grandfather Amin al-Dīn Nāṣir, former head of the financial administration of the Saljuq sultans of 'Irāq. He also worked out the value of the returns in dinārs of the Il-Khānid period.

⁶ Composed by 'Abdallāh Māzandarānī about 1364. It is not clear whether the figures given here refer to the time of the Il-Khān Abū Sa'id or Sultān Uvais. This *risāla* is examined and analysed in: Walter Hinz, "Das Rechnungswesen orientalischer Reichsfinanzämter im Mittelalter", *Der Islam*, vol. 29/1–2 (1949). We quote this article below.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

Regions of Īl-Khān state	Divān taxes of pre-Mongol period (<i>Nuzhat al-qulūb</i>)	Divān taxes 1335–40	Divān taxes (<i>Risāla-yi Falakīyya</i>)
Arabian 'Irāq	Over 30,000,000	3,000,000	2,500,000
Persian 'Irāq ('Irāq-i 'Ajam)	Over 25,000,000	2,333,600	3,500,000
Lur Great	—	90,000 (1,000,000)	320,000
Lur Little	—	90,000 (1,000,000) ^a	280,000
Āzarbājān	Approx. 20,000,000	2,160,000	—
Arrān and Mūghān	Over 3,000,000	303,000	—
Shīrvān	1,000,000	113,000	820,000
Gushtāsfī (delta of the Kur and the Araxes)	Approx. 1,000,000	118,500	—
Guristān and Abkhāz (Georgia)	Approx. 1,000,000	1,202,000	400,000

^a In both regions of Lur 1,000,000 dīnārs were collected, but the central divān received only 90,000, the rest being kept by the divāns of the local atabegs.

Regions of the Īl-Khān state	Divān taxes of pre-Mongol period (<i>Nuzhat al-qulūb</i>)	Divān dues in 1335–40	Divān taxes (<i>Risāla-yi Falakīyya</i>)
Rūm (Asia Minor)	Over 15,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000
Great Armenia	Approx. 2,000,000	390,000	—
Diyārbakr and Diyār Rabi'a (Upper Mesopotamia)	10,000,000	1,925,000	—
Kurdistān (Eastern, now Iranian)	Approx. 2,000,000	201,500	—
Khuzistān	Over 3,000,000	325,000	1,100,000
Fārs	Approx. 10,500,000 ^a	2,871,200	—
Shabānkāra	Over 2,000,000	266,100	4,000,000
Kirmān and Makrān	880,000	676,500	—
Total ^b	100,580,000	19,203,800	15,920,000

^a In 310 or 922.

^b In Īl-Khānid dīnārs. Detailed calculations and references to *Nuzhat al-qulūb* in: I. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie . . .*, pp. 96–100; see for figures from the *Risāla-yi Falakīyya* Walter Hinz, *op. cit.* pp. 133–4.

Thus, according to Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī, the seventeen regions forming the Īl-Khānid state paid the central divān 19,203,800 dīnars in 1335–40 as against 100,580,000 before the Mongol conquest, both sums being in Īl-Khānid dīnārs. In other words the revenue of the Īl-Khānid divān was but 19 per cent of that of the pre-Mongol period, and in some districts even less, 9–13 per cent. Also in the pre-Mongol and Mongol budgets sums which were paid to the divāns of vassal landowners and sums

GHAZAN'S REFORMS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

derived from the rent or tax on military fiefs—*iqtā'*, which had fiscal immunity, were not taken into account. Inasmuch as the situation remained the same in this respect,¹ the abrupt fall in tax-receipts can hardly be explained in any other way than by the general economic decline of Iran.

Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī does not give figures for eastern and northern Iran, since all taxes in Sīstān, Kūhistān, Khurāsān, Gurgān and Mazandarān were expended on the local budgets, and the central dīvān received nothing at all,² whilst it received only a tiny share of the local revenue of Gilān—a mere 20,000 dīnārs.³ *The Risāla-yi Falakīyya* gives the returns on the rent-tax of *khāṣṣa* lands, i.e. from the private estates of the Īl-Khāñ and his family, according to district:

	Dīnārs		Dīnārs
Khurāsān	4,220,000	Armenia	540,000
Māzandarān	2,370,000	Diyārbakr	430,000
Ray	754,220 ⁵ ^a	Āzarbājān	2,600,000
Gilān	1,220,000	Total from lands of the <i>khāṣṣa</i> ^b	<u>12,434,220⁵</u>
Kurdistān	300,000		

^a According to the *Nuzhat al-qulūb* (p. 55), 151,500 dīnārs were paid by the Ray *vilāyat* to the central dīvān; in pre-Mongol times Ray and its *vilāyat* paid 7,000,000 dīnārs.

^b W. Hinz, *op. cit.* pp. 133–4.

As is well known, taxes from *khāṣṣa* lands were not paid to the Great Dīvān (the central dīvān), but were paid to the private dīvān of the *khāṣṣa* for the upkeep of the Īl-Khan's quarters and those of his wives and the princes. According to the *Risāla-yi Falakīyya*, only 28,354,220⁵ dīnārs were paid annually by dīvān and *khāṣṣa* lands.⁴ The divergence in the figures—both the overall figures and those for particular districts quoted in the *Nuzhat al-qulūb* and *Risāla-yi Falakīyya*—makes us think that the budget given in the latter source cannot refer to 1334–5, as Hinz supposes. The *Nuzhat al-qulūb* in fact gives nominal figures for the years 1335–40, years of feudal civil strife and peasant uprisings. According to the *daftars* not a half of the amount collected under Ghazan was collected.⁵

¹ There were no fewer *iqtā'* lands under the Saljuqs, in all probability, than there were under Ghazan, judging by the fact that Malik-Shāh (1072–92) granted *iqtā'*s to 46,000 soldiers (Rāvandi, ed. Iqbāl, pp. 130–1).

² *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 147.

³ *Ibid.* p. 162.

⁴ In Hinz's article (pp. 133–4) the incorrect figure 28, 264,220⁵ dīnārs is given, as a result of a miscalculation.

⁵ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 27.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

Therefore it is possible to assert that the economy of Iran during and especially after Ghazan's reign did not reach its pre-Mongol level. A certain relative improvement was experienced mainly in agriculture. Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī gives reason for thinking that from Ghazan's time the irrigation works of all four types in use from ancient times in Iran—mountain springs, river channels, wells and *kārīz*, i.e. underground galleries (with clay pipelines, timbering and inspection-wells) for bringing underground water to the surface—were to a considerable extent restored. The same author gives almost complete information concerning the kind of irrigation in use in each district or *vilāyat*.¹

THE CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE AT THE END OF THE ĪL-KHĀNID PERIOD

We can judge the condition of agriculture in Iran after Ghazan's reforms not only from the *Nuzhat al-qulūb* but also from the anonymous Persian agrotechnical tract *Kitāb-i ‘ilm-i falāḥat u zirā‘at*, the author of which speaks of himself as a contemporary of Ghazan,² from regional historico-geographical works, from information given by travellers, and from the letters of Rashid al-Dīn.

According to these sources wheat and barley were cultivated wherever there were water supplies and wherever agriculture had been preserved. The author of the *Falāḥa* mentions many kinds of wheat and barley; millet was less widely distributed. Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī names more than twenty districts (including Ray, Qum, Tabrīz, Isfahān, all Khūzistān and some regions of Fārs and Khurāsān) with especially high yields of corn. Bread made from barley or millet, frequently with the admixture of beans, chestnuts, or acorns, was the bread of the poor.³ Rice was grown in the territory near to the Caspian and in a series of regions in Āzarbāijān, Persian ‘Irāq (Zanjān, etc.) and Fārs (Kurbāl, Firūzābād, etc.), and also in Khūzistān.⁴ The author of

¹ For the table based on this information see *Zemledelie...*, pp. 130–6.

² *Kitāb-i ‘ilm-i falāḥat u zirā‘at, ta’lif-i shakhs-i ‘alīm va ‘āmil va siyāḥī dar ‘abd-i Ghāzān Khān*. Lithographed edition of Persian text of Najm ad-Daula ‘Abd al-Ghaffar, Tehrān, 1322/1905. Henceforth we shall use the abbreviation *Falāḥa*. See concerning this tract: doctor Taqi Bahrāmī, *Ta’rikh-i kishāvarzī-yi Irān*; I. Petrushevsky, *Persidski Traktat po agrotekhnike vremeni Ghazan-khāna*, pp. 586–99.

³ See Sa’di, *Gulistān*, chapter 1, hikayat 7; Farhang Shams-i Fakhri, pp. 103 (no. 87), 124 (no. 96), 134 (no. 194). Ibn Battūta, vol. II, p. 32; *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 130.

⁴ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 62, 117, 163; *Mukātibāt-i Razīdī*, pp. 254–5 (no. 41), 271 (no. 45). Zāhir al-Dīn Mar’ashī, p. 413; Yāqūt, vol. II, p. 496; Zakariyyā Qazvīnī, vol. II, p. 102.

AGRICULTURE AT THE END OF THE ĪL-KHĀNID PERIOD

the *Falāḥa* informs us of various methods of cultivating rice. In some areas crops were a hundredfold and more, whilst the best rice was considered to be that of Gilān, the second best being that of Māzandarān. The same author says that under *Ghazan* experiments were carried out (in which the author took part) to sow the best kind of Indian rice in Iran, but without result.¹ Evidently the *zurrat*² of the author of the *Falāḥa* is wheat-sorghum (*anthropogon sorghum*). Much *dhurrat* was sown in the vilāyats of Kāshān and Iṣfahān, and the crops are supposed to have been nearly three-hundredfold.³ Rye and oats were unknown in Iran, as now.

First place amongst fodder-crops was taken by lucerne,⁴ used to feed horses. Greek clover was also known.⁵ Cotton was the most common of the textile plants, the cultivation of which pushed flax and other textile plants into the background. Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī speaks of the cultivation of cotton in a series of regions, some fifty or so, of Persian ‘Irāq (among them Ray, Qum, Nihāvand, Yazd); of Fārs—such as Shīrāz, Abarqūh, Kāzarūn, Lār; of Kirmān, Kūhistān, and Khurāsān (Khabūshān, Zāveh); throughout the whole of Khūzistān and Gurgān; and also in Māzandarān, Gilān, Qūmis, and Āzarbājān.⁶

According to the author of the *Falāḥa* cotton gave its finest crops in the *garmśir* regions, but was also cultivated on *sardśir* land,⁷ primarily in sandy clay areas (*rīgbūm*). Fine cotton (*narm*) and coarse cotton (*zibr*) were known, but in general Indian cotton was thought of as better than Iranian.⁸ Flax (*kattān*) was less widely grown in the fourteenth century than it had been in the tenth century, mostly in the south-west of Iran (the districts of Kāzarūn, Rīshahr, Sīnīz in Fārs), and not as a textile plant for the most part, but as a source of lamp-oil.⁹ Hemp was culti-

¹ *Falāḥa*, pp. 86–8.

² تُرْجَ for the correct تُرْجَ *dhurra* (Arabic).

³ *Falāḥa*, pp. 88–9.

⁴ Strabo mentions the culture of lucerne (μηδική) in Media, *Geography*, xi, 13.

⁵ *Shams-i Fakhri*, p. 33 (no. 32), under the term *Shambalid*.

⁶ See a table based on the *Nuzbat al-qulūb* in *Zemledelis* . . . , p. 195; also references. The list in the *Nuzbat al-qulūb* is not complete. Other cotton-producing regions are given in other sources, in particular the Herāt region (Saifi, p. 111).

⁷ As is well-known, medieval geographers in Moslem countries distinguished land according to its height, between “cold” (Arabic *surūd*, Persian *sardśir*, more than 1,000–1,200 m above sea-level) and “hot” (Arabic *jurūm*, Persian *garmśir*, less than 1,000–1,200 m above sea-level) districts. The coasts of the Caspian Sea and of the Persian Gulf belonged to the *garmśir*, as did the province of Khūzistān. *Sardsir* were the Iranian uplands, excepting the various depressions (Sīstān, the Balkh oasis, etc.). In conformity with this idea cultivated plants were divided into *garmśir* = subtropical, and *sardśir* = all the rest.

⁸ *Falāḥa*, pp. 93–4.

⁹ *Nuzbat al-qulūb*, pp. 126, 130–1.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

vated not so much as a textile, but rather for the production of a well-known narcotic (Arabic *ḥashīsh*, Persian *bang*); evidently the distribution of hemp was not widespread, judging by the fact that Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī and Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū do not mention it in their geographical works. The same can be said of the castor-oil plant (*ricinus communis*) and of safflower (*carthamus tinctorius*). Saffron was made from the plant called in Arabic *za'farān* which yielded a yellow-orange dye (Burūjird, Rūdhrāvar, Qum, Hamadān, Kūhistān).¹ Other dye-yielding plants were madder, which gave a red dye (*Khwāf* in *Khurāsān*,² and other regions), henna, which gave an orange dye and was used for cosmetic and medicinal purposes,³ and indigo, which yielded a blue dye and had been cultivated in Persia from the sixth century but was only commonly met with in Kirmān.⁴ Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī does not mention it in the fourteenth century, but the author of the *Falāḥa* says that the cultivation of indigo had ceased in Iran, and that it was imported from India, despite the fact that *Ghazan* had attempted to revive its cultivation.⁵ Cultivation of the opium poppy, known in Iran from the end of the eleventh or twelfth centuries, was insignificant, to judge from the rarity of references to it in the sources. Sesame occupied the leading position amongst the oil-plants, and sesame oil had practically replaced olive oil.

The melon was grown everywhere in Iran, in the words of the author of *Falāḥa*, “in every garden”,⁶ and there were many varieties of it. In the garden of one “refuge of a *naqibat* (*naqābat panāh*)”, i.e. of an elder (*naqib*) of the Sayyids, a religious fief-holder, the Herāt soil grew fifty kinds of melon.⁷ Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī names ten regions (amongst others, Isfahān, Tabrīz and Marv) producing the best melons which were exported.⁸ The pumpkin was also grown throughout Iran,⁹ as were cucumbers (particularly in Gilān, Māzandarān, Shīrāz, Isfahān).¹⁰ The water-melon is however rarely spoken of; Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī only mentions it as growing in Qazvin.¹¹

Vegetable-growing was less developed in the period under consideration than fruit-growing; vegetables were to be found for the most

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 70, 73, 144, 146; *Falāḥa*, p. 112.

² *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 154. The author of the *Falāḥa* also mentions the regions of Yazd and Nā'in (p. 94).

³ Continuation of the *Ta'rīkh-i Sīstān*, p. 396.

⁴ *Hudūd al-'alam*, Persian text, f. 26b, English translation, pp. 123-4.

⁵ *Falāḥa*, pp. 92-3.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 94-5.

⁷ *Irshād az-zirā'a*, manuscript of Peshchereva, f. 87 (types of melon named).

⁸ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 49, 58, 67, 77, 144, 152, 153, 155, 157.

⁹ *Falāḥa*, p. 105.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 100.

¹¹ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 58.

AGRICULTURE AT THE END OF THE İL-KHĀNID PERIOD

part near to the large commercial cities, such as İsfahān.¹ The *Falāḥa* describes in detail the vegetables and spices which were cultivated in Iran at the beginning of the fourteenth century; the most common of them were cabbages, carrots, onions, garlic, rue, mangel-wurzels and also leguminous plants.

As at an earlier date, fruit-growing occupied an outstanding position in the economy of Iran under the Mongols. Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī enumerates more than eighty regions of Iran where fruit-growing was widespread and produced abundant crops. Among them was for example Sīstān where horticulture has almost disappeared nowadays. The fig-palm occupied the foremost position amongst the *garsmīr* plants, and was cultivated in Gurgān and Māzandarān, as well as Khuzistān, Fārs, Kirmān and Sīstān. The citrus fruits—the lemon, orange, and bitter orange—were grown in the southern and Caspian regions. The coconut-palm only grew in the regions of Hurmuz and Wāsit,² whilst the olive grew only in Khūzistān and near to the Caspian in small quantities. The sugar-cane was cultivated in Khūzistān, Kirmān and Balkh, and its export and cultivation had greatly declined in comparison with the previous centuries. According to the author of the *Falāḥa* the sugar produced in his time was poor in quality and reddish in colour, and Iranian craftsmen were unable to make refined sugar (*qand*).³ The peach, apricot, plum, pear, apple (of which there were more than nowadays), pomegranate, mulberry tree, walnut, almond, pistachio (wild in eastern districts only) were the commonest sardsīr plants. The fig was also widely distributed, both the *garsmīr* and the sardsīr varieties.⁴ The remaining sardsīr fruits were less widespread. In particular it was not the custom to grow the black and red cherry, the filbert and chestnut, in the garden; but the hazel-nut and the other fruits and nuts just mentioned were plentiful in the wild.⁵ Viticulture was also highly developed.

Hamd Allāh Qazvīnī and other authors name about seventy regions in which the best vines were cultivated. There were many varieties. In one district alone, Pūshang (Khurāsān) a hundred kinds of vine were being grown.⁶ In the horticultural enterprise of the naqib near Herāt, which we mentioned, exactly a hundred varieties of vine were under cultivation.⁷ Apparently after Ghazan's reforms viticulture did not

¹ See, for example, *Tarjuma-yi Mahāsin-i İsfahān*, pp. 46, 64.

² *Falāḥa*, p. 46.

³ *Ibid.* p. 102.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 15, 21, 29.

⁶ *Nuzhat al-qulub*, p. 153.

⁷ *Irshād al-zirā'a*, cited manuscript, f. 80.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

achieve the level it had attained around the beginning of the thirteenth century. Thus Ibn Funduq, writing about 1168, informs us of the abundance of vines in the regions of Baihaq and Nīshāpūr, but Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī says nothing of Nīshāpūr grapes, and states that few grapes were grown in Baihaq.¹ Dried fruit and grapes were exported from a number of regions (Īsfahān, etc.) to such distant countries as Asia Minor (Rūm), India and China (via Başra).² Wine-making and the drinking of wine were very widespread, despite the Islamic prohibition. Date-palm brandy and other alcoholic drinks were produced and consumed.³ The cultivation of flowers and scented plants (*mashmūmāt*) had also been preserved in Iran—in Fārs and Māzandarān⁴—and they were used in the production of perfumes, cosmetics, medicaments, aromatic essences (flower-waters), and flower-oils, especially the renowned rose-oil, etc.⁵

Unlike other branches of agriculture silk-growing (i.e. the culture of the silk-worm) not only showed no sign of decline in the second half of the thirteenth and the fourteenth century, but showed progress. If in the tenth century the main areas of silk-production were the Marv oasis, Gurgān, Māzandarān, and the Barda'a valley in Arrān and Shīrvān, and the silk-weavers of, say, Khūzistān worked the raw imported silk of Barda'a, in the period under consideration silk-weaving existed also in the Yazd oasis, in Fārs (in the region of Bishāpūr), Kūhistān (Turshīz, Gunābād), Khurāsān (Khwāf and Zāveh) and Gilān,⁶ as well as the areas previously mentioned. At the beginning of the thirteenth century Gilān silk was still considered to be of poor quality,⁷ but by the end of the thirteenth century its quality had so improved that merchants came from Genoa to buy it.⁸ Italian sources of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries—the commercial records of the Florentines Pegolotti and Uzziano, the statutes of Pisa, etc., utilized by W. Heyd in his book—know of the following sorts of raw silk imported from Iran for manufacture in the towns of Italy: *seta ghella*—Gilān silk;

¹ *Ta'rikh-i Baihaq*, p. 273; cf. *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 147, 150.

² *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 37, 49.

³ For details see the article of I. Petrushevsky, "Vinogradarstvo i vinodelie v Irane v XIII–XV vv.", *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik*, vol. xi (1956).

⁴ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 118, 160; Ibn al-Balkhī repeats other details in this source in the *Fārs-Nāma*, pp. 134, 142, 143, 147, 148.

⁵ See *Falāḥa*, pp. 40–3 (the method of making rose-oil is also described here); *Mukātibāt-i Rasbidi*, pp. 54 (no. 18), 93 (no. 21), 272 (no. 45).

⁶ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 74, 126 (compare Ibn al-Balkhī, p. 142), 143–5, 154, 159–60, 163.

⁷ *Yāqūt*, vol. IV, p. 344.

⁸ Marco Polo, trans. Yule, vol. I, p. 54. Compare V. V. Barthold, *Istoriko-geograficheskii obzor Irana*, p. 157.

AGRICULTURE AT THE END OF THE ĪL-KHĀNID PERIOD

seta masandroni—Amul silk from Māzandarān; *seta stravatina* or *seta stravai*—Astrabad silk from Gurgān; *seta talani*—Dailam (?) silk; *seta mardacascia*—silk from Marv-i Shāhijān, etc.¹

According to the author of the *Falāḥa* a special kind of mulberry tree (white mulberry) was used for the culture of the silkworm. It did not have much fruit, but many leaves, “for one *diram* of *pupae* (*tukhm-i kirm*) eats 500 *mans* of leaves and gives one *man* of silk”.² The organization of silk-production was best managed in the Yazd oasis. There one mulberry tree yielded 500 *mans* of leaves and one *man* of raw silk, as much as was yielded in other regions by 4–5 dirams of silkworm.³ The culture of cochineal still had some importance—although incomparably less than that of silk—and was used in the manufacture of red dye which was then exported to a number of countries. Cochineal was collected near Marand in Āzarbājān,⁴ and to the south of Ararat.⁵

In general an impression is created that irrigation (in particular the construction of *karizes* and channels, and the building of dams)⁶ and agricultural engineering were kept up in Iran after the Mongol conquest. But there was no noticeable progress in the application of the tools of labour. This is most readily explained by the dominant form of feudal exploitation of the peasantry (the quit-rent system) and the high rates of feudal rent, as a consequence of which the introduction of improvements in tools (the same that have survived into the twentieth century) was advantageous neither to the peasant nor to the land-owner.

THE TOWN IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

From what has been said previously, it is evident to what extent the towns had suffered after the Mongol conquest—in particular the large cities such as Marv, Balkh, Herāt, Nishāpūr, Ray, Qazvin and so on. Some of the shattered and ravaged cities were restored, as was Herāt in 1236, but they were now much smaller. In 639 or 1241/2 there were 6,900 people in Herāt.⁷ But Herāt was again sacked several times, as we have already seen, and only became a large city again under the

¹ W. Heyd, *Geschichte des Levantbandels*, pp. 650–3.

² *Falāḥa*, p. 23; 1 *diram* is here equivalent to 3 grammes (*diram* = *dirham*) approx.; 1 *man* (here Tabriz) equals about 3 kilogrammes.

³ *Falāḥa*, pp. 21–5.

⁴ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 88.

⁵ Clavijo, p. 156.

⁶ The Shāhib-Divān Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juvainī (executed in 1284) built a great dam on the river Gāvmāsā near Sāveh (*Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 221); Rashid al-Dīn spent 700,000 dinārs on the reconstruction of the dam on the river Kārūn (*Mukātabāt-i Rāshidī*, p. 180, no. 33).

⁷ Saifi, p. 238.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

Timūrids. According to the well-informed Rashid al-Dīn, on the eve of Ghazan's reforms five out of every ten houses in the sacked cities of Iran were uninhabited.¹ In Nakhchivān as late as the reign of Sultān Uvais five out of six houses were empty, the occupants having gone to live elsewhere.² The heavy tax on crafts and trade, which had not existed under the pre-Mongol rulers,³ hampered the revival of town-life. If we take into consideration the remarks of Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī that many towns were still ruined and that others had become villages we can make the deduction that in general urban life had suffered a decline in Iran during the Mongol period.

But this decline did not affect all towns. Some towns and cities revived after the reforms of Ghazan and made considerable economic progress. This depended not only on the fact that there were towns which had not been destroyed during the conquest (Tabriz for example avoided destruction by paying the conquerors), but also on the economic nature of the town. In medieval Iran towns could be divided into several economic types. First of all there were many small and medium-sized towns occupied in commerce and craft-industry serving a limited local market. Other towns of a moderate size were centres of craft-industry producing exports for the international market such as Kāzārūn—the centre of flax-spinning, Yazd—weaving silk—and Kāshān—the centre of the ceramics industry—which also weaved silk and made carpets.

There were city-emporiums lying on international caravan and shipping routes, which were storing places, points for trans-shipping, and exchanges for the export and transit trades, such as Tabriz, Marāgheh, Hamadān, Qazvin, Isfahān, Shīrāz, Nishāpūr, etc. Hurmuz, transferred from the coast to a bare little island in the Persian Gulf, flourished entirely thanks to the transit of Iranian, Arabic, Western European, Indian and Chinese goods. Frequently such towns were also centres of craft-industry serving the international market, as Isfahān (cotton and silk-weaving) and Shīrāz (iron goods, wool-weaving, the production of rose and other flower oils and aromatic essences).⁴ There is no

¹ *Jāmi‘ al-tavārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 558–9.

² *Dastūr al-kātib*, p. 167a.

³ *Nāṣir ad-dīn Tūsi*, p. 761. *Tamgha* was collected on each business transaction, even in the case of prostitution and the sale of wine. The exact size of the *tamgha* is not known, but from one of the letters of Rashid al-Dīn (no. 13, see below) it is possible to conclude that until the time of Ghazan it was paid at the rate of 10 per cent of the value of each deal. The *tamgha* was retained in Iran, but at a reduced rate, until the reign of Tahmāsp I.

⁴ Rose water and other aromatic liquids were even exported to China from Fārs in the twelfth–thirteenth centuries; see Chau Ju-Kua, p. 134.

THE TOWN IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

doubt that the great city-emporiums by far surpassed the greatest cities of Western Europe of the late medieval period, such as Venice, Milan, Florence or Paris, in the scale of their economic activities and their populations (at least before the Mongol invasion). Thus we should pay a certain respect to the figures given in the sources for the populations of the giant cities of the pre-Mongol period.¹ In general we do not possess reliable statistical information for the Mongol period as regards population, but we do have some figures for the fifteenth century. Clavijo fixes the population of Tabriz in 1403 at 200,000 households.² An anonymous historian of Shāh Ismā'il, more modestly, and probably more correctly, gives the figure as from 200,000 to 300,000 people. The Mongols are supposed to have slaughtered about 800,000 people in Baghdad in 1258, whilst Timūr is said to have killed 90,000 in 1401. Josapha Barbaro gives the population of Iṣfahān³ as a mere 50,000 in the second half of the fifteenth century. That of Kāshān he gives as 20,000 households (= families, i.e. approx. 90,000 people), and that of Shīrāz as 200,000 households (about 900,000 people), which is probably a great exaggeration.⁴ Such towns were able to recover quickly after the Mongol conquest and even to prosper because of income from exports and the transit trade, despite high rates of taxation (*tamgha*). This prosperity however came to a rapid end and such towns were deserted when the trade routes altered, as happened in the case of the south Iranian port of Sīrāf, the importance of which passed to Hormuz. Towns living off the transit trade had comparatively little influence on the economic development of Iran as a whole, although of course they influenced the economies of the suburban regions. It is in part possible to assess the development of such towns, as well as the market character of their suburban agriculture, from their tax-returns. Regrettably Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī rarely gave figures for tax (*tamgha*) paid by cities separately from that paid by the cities and their surrounding districts (see p. 508).

The residences of the Il-Khāns represented a peculiar type of town or city. Such were Marāgheh, Tabriz, Ujān, and the bazaar-cities that had arisen around the Il-Khānid headquarters (*ordu*)—the summer camps

¹ See above, pp. 485–6.

² That is “families”. Persian *khāna*, lit. house, signified “family” ordinarily. Assuming that the average family consisted of 4·5 persons, we obtain 900,000 inhabitants of Tabriz. This is an evident exaggeration.

³ Iṣfahān was sacked twice after the Mongols had pillaged it (1237), by Timūr and during the reign of Jahān-Shāh.

⁴ Barbaro, pp. 72–4.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

(Ala-Tagh, Sultāniyeh) and the winter ones (Mahmūdābād). According to Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī the tamgha paid in Sultāniyeh rose from 200,000 to 300,000 dinārs when the khan had his residence (*ordu*) there. The satisfaction of the requirements of the Court and trade with the nearby summer camps (*yailaq*) of the Mongols gave both wages and income to the motley population of craftsmen and traders gathered in Sultāniyeh.¹ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa calls Marāgheh a little Damascus.²

<i>Vilāyat</i>	Tax (<i>tamgha</i>) from cities in dīnārs	Tax (<i>kharāj</i>) from the country district in dīnārs
Tabrīz	875,000	275,000
Baġhdād	800,000	—
Šīrāz	450,000	—
Wāsit	448,000	—
Isfahān	350,000	500,000
Hamadān	105,000	136,000
Marāgheh	70,000	185,000
Qazvīn	55,000	55,000 ^a

^a *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 78, 36, 116, 47, 50, 71–2, 87, 59 respectively.

It is worthy of note that, whereas the Arab geographers of the ninth and tenth centuries and an anonymous Persian at the end of the tenth century give detailed information concerning articles produced by craftsmen and their export from the towns of Iran, Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī and Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū say almost nothing about the economic life of the towns, although they dwell upon the agricultural production of various regions in some detail. In this it is impossible not to see reflected the decline of the towns. Essentially we know very little about the economy of the towns and life in them during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Nevertheless *objets d'art* in museums and various collections witness to the fact that Iranian craftsmanship remained at a high level.³ In the correspondence of *Rashīd* al-Din the following articles of export from various towns are mentioned: Tabrīz—monochrome woven silks (*kimkha*), cloth of camel-hair, variously coloured velvets (*qatifa-yi alvān*), shagreen and leather footwear, fur and fur goods; Šīrāz—cotton cloths (*karbās*) and printed cotton goods, linen (*qadaq* of Kāzarūn), leather footwear; Isfahān—cotton cloths *valad*, *ābyārī*, *shamsiyā*, etc.; Kāzarūn—cotton cloths; Kāshān—woven silks; Herāt—*kimkha* and other silken cloths.⁴

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 55–6.

² Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, vol. I, p. 171.

³ For more detail see: Zāki Muḥammad Ḥasan, *Sānāyi-i Irān ba'd Islām*, tarjuma-yi Fārsī-yi Muḥammad 'Ali Khalkhālī. ⁴ *Mukātabāt-i Rashīdī*, pp. 183 ff. (n. 34).

THE TOWN IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The towns of the pre-Mongol period and after had no overall self-government such as that given by statute to the city communes of the eleventh–sixteenth centuries and the German imperial cities in western Europe. There was however self-administration within the limits of the quarter (*maballa*; the householders of the quarter, gathering in the mosque, elected their mayor, discussed their business) and the guild or corporation—either merchant, craft, or religious. The corporations of the Sayyids and their elders—*naqib*—in particular were very influential; there were about 1,400 Sayyids in the *Shirāz* corporation.¹ The influence of the Sūfi-dervish *shaikhs* was also enormous. At the beginning of the thirties of the thirteenth century the majority of the population in *Balkh* were *murīds* of *Shaikh Bahā'* al-Din Valad, the father of *Jalāl al-Din Rūmī*.² A century later the inhabitants of *Ardabil* were thought to be mostly *murīds* of *Shaikh Ṣafī al-Din Ishāq*, the ancestor of the Ṣafavid dynasty.³ In the towns the power of the local feudal landowner, known generally under the title of *malik*, was interwoven with the power of the khan's vicegerent (Mongol *basqaq*, Persian *shahna*) who controlled the activities of the *malik*, collected taxes and was endowed with military might.⁴

The town nobility as previously had great influence in the towns forming a kind of patriciate. These were landowners or feudalists of the surrounding area who before the Saljuq conquest had lived in their castles, but who now lived more often in the towns than upon their estates. The characteristic peculiarity of this nobility was its close connexion with the great commercial companies and with big wholesale and transit trade. They invested a part of their income in the companies of the great wholesale merchants, called usually *urtag* (Turkish *ortag*—“partner in a share”, investor), “the Emperor’s own merchants” (*tujjār-i khāṣṣ*), or “trustworthy merchants” (*tujjār-i amin*), who returned the feudal lords their share of the profit in goods, mostly textiles. Thus the above-mentioned vizier, the historian *Rashid al-Din*, himself a great feudal landowner,⁵ invested a major part of his fortune, 32,500,000 dīnārs out of 35,000,000, in a large wholesale undertaking; “the greater part of the money I gave to trustworthy merchants (*tujjār-i amin*)”, writes *Rashid al-Din* in his will, “and they conduct their trade with this money, and I have written down their names in my

¹ Ibn Battūṭa, vol. II, p. 78.

² *Aflāki*, trans. Huart, pp. 7-9, 15.

³ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 81.

⁴ For more on the inner structure of the towns and corporations see A. K. S. Lambton, *Islamic Society in Persia*.

⁵ See below, pp. 521-2.

IRAN UNDER THE İL-KHĀNS

account book".¹ In his letters Rashid al-Din gives huge lists of goods, mostly textiles, and partly leather and fur goods, etc., which he had received from the merchants.² Such a rapprochement of some groups of feudalists with the large-scale merchants is a phenomenon typical of medieval Iran, as also of other lands of the Near and Middle East. Thus in contrast to Western Europe from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries the merchants did not oppose the great feudal landowners, but made common cause with them against the craftsmen, the lower classes of the towns and the local peasantry.³

The town authorities—*ra'is* (mayor), *qādī* (the religious judge and head of the religious estate in the area), *khatib* (the imam of the mosque meeting), *muhāsib* (the censor of morals supervising bazaars, social life, and morals of the citizens), and others—came from the local patriciate. Often they inherited their positions. As did the family of the Qādiyān in Shiraz, the Mustaufiyān in Qazvin⁴ and the Juvainiyān in Khurāsān.⁵ The writer of these lines analysed the information given by Ḥamid Allāh Qazvīnī concerning the aristocratic families of his native town of Qazvin in order to give an idea of the nature of the urban nobility of his time.⁶ It appears that despite the fact that on 7 Ša'bān 717/7 October 1220 the Mongols had carried out a "whole-sale massacre",⁷ many of the local noble families survived or were spared. Of the 28 families mentioned by the author 25 had settled in Qazvin long before the Mongol conquest,⁸ and only three (one of Mongol, one of Turkish, and one of Persian origin) again distinguished themselves in the service of the Mongol İl-Khāns. These families possessed estates in the district of Qazvin and carried out state and religious duties.⁹

¹ *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, p. 238 (no. 36).

² *Ibid.* pp. 183–93 (no. 34), 282–9 (no. 47).

³ See Barthold, *K istorii krestyanskikh dvizhenii v Persii*, pp. 61–2.

⁴ The hereditary heads of the financial administration of the district. From this family came the historian and geographer Ḥamid Allāh Mustaufī Qazvīnī (approx. 1280–1350).

⁵ From these came the *şāhib-dīvān* Shams al-Dīn Muhammad Juvainī and his brother 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Atā-Malik Juvainī.

⁶ *Tārikh-i guzida*, Persian text, pp. 842–9; abridged English translation, pp. 233–6. More detail in I. Petrushevsky, *Gorodskaya zhizn' i gosudarstve Hulaguidov*, pp. 88–96.

⁷ Dramatically described by Ḥamid Allāh Qazvīnī in his *Zafar-nāma*; see text in E. G. Browne, *LHP*, vol. III, pp. 96–8.

⁸ Amongst this ancient aristocracy outstanding were the Zākāniyān, from whom stemmed the poet 'Ubaid-i Zākānī (died 1371) and the Ghaffāriyān, from whom sprang the Şāfi'i theologian Najm al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ghaffār (died 1267), and the theologian of the sixteenth-century, Ahmad Ghaffārī.

⁹ Sadr al-Dīn Khālidī was the grand vizier under Geikhatū; for more than sixty years, from 651 = 1253/4, the maliks of Qazvin were by inheritance of the Iftikhāriyān family.

THE TOWN IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

Noble families owned large estates with servants and slaves, suburban gardens, and sometimes whole quarters, in the towns. The enormous quarter or rather suburb rebuilt by Rashid al-Din in Tabriz, belonging to him by right of unconditional ownership (*mulk*), is described not without boasting in his letter to his son Sa'd al-Din, the governor of Qinnisrin and 'Awāsim.¹ In this quarter (Rub'i Rashidi) he claims that there were 30,000 homes (= families),² 24 caravansarais, 1,500 shops, bath-houses, gardens, mills, workshops for weaving (*sha'r-bāfi*) and papermaking (*kāghad-bāzī*), a dye-works (*rangraz-khāna*), a mint (*dār al-darb*), etc. Rashid al-Din brought tradesmen (*sānā'i* va *muhtarafa*) from a variety of towns to his suburb, and asked his son to send 50 wool-weavers (*sūf-bāfān*) from Antioch and Cilicia, and 20 from Cyprus. Four-hundred theologians and lawyers were settled here in the "quarter of the learned" (*kūcha-yi 'ulamā'), and there were 1,000 students (*zālib-i 'ilm*).³ Fifty of the best doctors of Syria, Egypt, India, and China (oculists, surgeons, bonesetters) worked in the hospital (*dār al-shifā*), and so on. In Hamadān Rashid al-Din had his own quarter with 1,500 houses. Nobles, mosques, theological academies or madrasas, and religious bodies owned by right of *mulk* or *vaqf* caravansarais, bazaars, and shops, which they leased for rent and from which they derived income.*

In medieval Iran there were four fundamental centres of social life in a town: the *shabristān* and the quarters of the patriciate; the madrasas, the *khāngāhs* of the dervishes, and other religious institutions together with religious corporations and dervish brotherhoods; the bazaar centre (Persian *chārsū*, Arabic *murabb'a*), together with the caravansarais, big merchants, and wholesale trade; and the quarters of the craftsmen, and their corporations (Arabic *sinf*, plural *asnāf*), the lesser bazaars with their petty retail trade. Wares were sold by craftsmen in the workshops, the latter also serving as shops (*dukkān* in Arabic). Most often but not always craftsmen of one and the same trade lived in the same quarter; in every town there were quarters occupied by silk-weavers, cotton-carders, shoemakers, saddlemakers, dyers, potters, etc.

The sources are meagre concerning the craftsmen's corporations.⁴ Ibn Battūta mentions them, saying that the Isfahān craftsmen elected

¹ *Mukātabāt-i Rashidi*, pp. 315-27 (no. 51).

² *Ibid.* p. 318; سی هزار خانه "thirty" is perhaps a mistake for ۳۰ "three".

³ *Ibid.* pp. 318-20; apart from the 1,000 students mentioned there were another 6,000 supported by Rashid al-Din who studied in Tabriz itself.

⁴ Concerning the corporations see A. K. S. Lambton, *Islamic Society in Persia*, pp. 17 ff.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

elders from amongst themselves (*al-kulū*, Persian *kulū*, *kulūi*).¹ He also mentions guilds of craftsmen in *Shirāz*. In the sources rank is mentioned: *ustād* “master”, *khalifa* “apprentice”,² and *shāgird* “pupil”, apprentice. The craft guilds in the towns of Iran were much weaker than the guilds of western Europe. They could not obtain a corporative monopoly nor could they fix the price of their products to their greatest satisfaction, as was the case in western Europe. A connexion is traceable between the craft guilds and the dervish brotherhoods.³ In literature there is more than one mention of the connexion between the corporations and the movement of the *futuwwa*—the unions of the *ākhīs*.⁴ The *ākhīs* are also mentioned in the towns of the fourteenth century,⁵ but there is no information concerning a connexion between them and the guilds. There were also corporations of déclassé indigent elements (*ayyārān*)⁶ and guilds of beggars (*sāsāniyān* or *sāsiyān*).⁷

Corporate craftsmen were freemen although they had to give part of their produce to the treasury or to the local landowner, and take part without recompense in the construction of public buildings and in the decoration of the city for festivals organized by the authorities. But there were also unfree craftsmen working in the towns of Iran and Central Asia under the Mongols. At the time of the Mongol invasion many craftsmen were turned into slaves; some of them (for example

¹ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, vol. II, p. 45.

² Ethnological investigation of Central Asian craft guilds show that there were thought to be two ranks in the corporations—apprentice (*shāgird*) and master (*ustād*); *khalifa* was the title of a person who had qualified as a master but who did not have the means to start his own *dukkān* and who worked for another craftsman. When a *khalifa* was able to start his own workshop he required no new initiation. The initiation of a master necessitated a threefold act: the reading of the first *surā* of the Qur'ān, the tying on of a belt (*kamarbandī*), and a ritual feast, called *arvāb-i pīr*. See, for example, E. M. Peshchereva, *Goncharnoe proizvodstvo v Srednei Azii* (Moscow, 1959), pp. 313–72. The Persian guilds are first mentioned in the Georgian hagiographic source of the sixth century—*The Life of St Eustaphius of Mtskheta*.

³ Aflākī, translated by Huart, p. 117, says that during the lifetime of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī the greater part of the dervishes of the Maulavī order consisted of craftsmen and poor people; the life of Ṣafī al-Dīn also mentions many murid craftsmen of the Shaikh Ṣafī al-Dīn (*Safvat al-safā, passim*).

⁴ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, vol. II, pp. 260–5.

⁵ *Safvat al-safā*, ff. 54b, 142b, 155b, 163b, 332b, 353b, 484b, 497b, 497a, etc.

⁶ A. K. S. Lambton, *op. cit.* pp. 117 f., and for the *Akhāvi* and the *Futuwwa* VI. Gordlevsky, *Gosudarstvo Sel'džukov Maloi Azii*, pp. 103–106; see also the bibliography of the subject in the latter work.

⁷ Legend connected the creation of a guild of beggars with the descendants of the Sassanids (see the *Burhān-i Qāti'* under *اسان* *Sāsān*). Regarding the *Sāsiyān* and their secret language or argot see the *qasida* of Abū Dulaf (tenth century; *Thā'ālibī*, *Yatīmat al-Dahr*, Damascus, 1304, vol. III, pp. 179–94) and the manuscript of the fourteenth century in the *Kitāb-i Sāsiyān*.

THE TOWN IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

the silkweavers of Herāt) were taken to Mongolia, some remained in Iran and worked in special large workshops (*kār-khāna*) belonging to the treasury, or the Il-Khānid family, and so on. Rashid al-Dīn mentions *kār-khānas* in Khabūshān, Nishāpūr, Tūs, Isfara'in, Tabrīz,¹ Vaṣṣāf speaks of *kār-khānas* and craftsmen belonging to individual Chingizids in Bukhārā and Samarqand,² whilst Saifī mentions a *kār-khāna* in Herāt.³ It is evident from a decree of Ghazan that craftsmen working in such large workshops—saddlers, tanners, armourers, etc.—were slaves (*asirān*), and received no wages in money. Payment was in kind, but most of this payment was stolen by officials running the workshops. The whole product of the enslaved craftsmen went to the Dīvān. Since such labour was not very productive, Ghazan put the craftsmen on a fixed tax, after paying which the slaves could work for themselves.⁴

A general phenomenon of the Iranian economy during the Il-Khān period was the decline of commodity economy (which remained in the areas near the main caravan routes and the large towns) and the growth of natural economy. Taxes from agricultural districts were mostly paid in kind—primarily in grain.⁵ And although the geographical work of Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī shows taxes in money, it is evident from a list of taxes from Khūzistān quoted by Rashid al-Dīn in a letter to his son Shihāb al-Dīn, ruler of Khūzistān, that the basic tax—the land tax—was paid in kind, in the form of grain and as a share of the crop.⁶ The wages (*mavājib*) and pensions (*marṣūmāt*) of the military caste, theologians, shaikhs and others were mostly paid in kind—in the form of wheat, barley, rice, cattle, etc.⁷ In one of his letters Rashid al-Dīn gives a list of fruits which his estates were to supply him with for the winter. The estates, lying in different parts of the country, had to send 50,000 *mans* of grapes, 62,000 *mans* of pomegranates, 37,000 *mans* of apples, 5,900 *mans* of raisins, 4,500 *mans* of fine raisins (*kishmish*), 9,000 *mans* of pears, 7,000 *mans* of quince, 100,000 *mans* of dates, 200,000 oranges, 20,000 lemons and other fruits and fruit-juices.⁸ The fact that Rashid al-Dīn did not buy this mass of fruit on the spot at his

¹ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 30, 179, 414.

² Vaṣṣāf, pp. 67, 68; see *ibid.* p. 51, concerning the dependants (craftsmen?) of the Chingizids in Bukhara; analysis of text in I. Petrushevsky, *Iz istorii Bukhari v XIII v.*, pp. 114-17.

³ Saifī, p. 285.

⁴ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 542-5.

⁵ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 474-5; *Mukātibāt-i Rashidi*, pp. 122-3 (no. 22); cf. *ibid.* p. 121: "with the stipulation that they be paid in kind."

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 252-6 (no. 41), 265-72 (no. 45).

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 198-206 (no. 34).

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

winter residence in Tabrīz, but brought it from distant regions, shows that the historian-minister extracted feudal rent from his estates primarily in kind.

FEUDAL RELATIONSHIPS. THE CATEGORIES OF LANDOWNERSHIP

The Mongol conquest had a great and in general evil influence on the economic development of Iran; it had much less influence on the social structure of the country. The most typical features of specifically Iranian feudalism antedating the conquest survived it also. Such were the outstanding importance of irrigation; the coexistence of settled agriculture and nomadic and semi-nomadic cattle-breeding; the absence of demesne and *corvée* in the villages; the combination of large-scale feudal landownership with small-scale peasant tenants; the predominance of product rent (money and labour rent had only secondary importance); the growth of the military fief system; the close connexion between the big merchants and the caravan trade and a group of feudal lords, and even their coalescence; the absence of self-governing towns, so typical of western Europe in the Middle Ages; and the widespread use of slave labour in the crafts and agriculture (irrigation and market gardening) alongside the exploitation of the labour of dependent peasants. Rāshīd al-Dīn employed 1,000 (500 men and 500 women) and 200 (100 men and 100 women) enslaved prisoners (*asīrān* *va* *ghulāmān*) respectively in the great gardens Fathābād and Rāshīdābād near Tabrīz—Georgians, negroes, Abyssinians, Greeks and Kurds (?), who “showed zeal in the planting of the vine and of fruit trees, in the digging of channels underground (*qanavātī*) and on the surface (*anhār*), in the watering and gathering of fruit”.¹

The governing class of feudal lords consisted of four main groups: (1) the military aristocracy of the nomad tribes—Mongol, Turkish, Kurd, etc.; (2) the settled local provincial nobility, not connected by service with the central government; (3) the civil service; (4) the Muslim religious caste, more exactly the theologians. The last three groups were primarily composed of Iranians. These feudal groups, who struggled with one another to control the State, expressed two parallel political tendencies in Iranian society—that of feudal disintegration together with a system of military fiefs, and that of a centralized feudal state

¹ *Mukātabāt-i Rāshīdī*, p. 53 (no. 17); cf. *ibid.* pp. 194-5 (no. 34), 236 (no. 36).

THE CATEGORIES OF LANDOWNERSHIP

together with a ramifying bureaucratic apparatus. Opposed to this class of exploiters was the principal exploited class—the settled peasantry. The nomads were also exploited by their nomad feudal lords, but on a much smaller scale. The nomad feudalists exploited not only the nomads subject to them, but also the settled peasants who dwelt on their fiefs. Along with the class division there existed that of estates:¹ “people of the sword” (*ahl-i shamsibîr*—the first two groups mentioned), “people of the pen” (*ahl-i qalam*—the last two groups of feudalists mentioned), and the taxable estate or the *ra'iyyat* (Arabic *ra'âya*, plural of *ra'iyyat*, literally “herd” or “flock”—the peasants and townspeople. This latter division of the population, not reflected in Muslim law, was evidently a survival from the Sassanian period, when society was divided into soldiers, priests, clerks, and the taxable people, composed of peasants, craftsmen and merchants.

The old categories of feudal landownership long recognized by Muslim law (to be more explicit, conditional and unconditional ownership of land and water, i.e. irrigation works) continued to exist under the *Il-Khâns*: (1) State lands (Arabo-Persian *arâdî-yi dîvânî*); (2) the private demesne of the *Il-Khân* and the members of his family (Arabic *khâssa*, Mong. synonym *injîi*); (3) the lands of the religious and charitable institutions (*arâdî-yi vaqfi*); (4) the lands of private persons belonging to them by unconditional right, Arabic *mulk*, *milk*, Arabo-Persian *arâdî-yi mâlikî*, *arbâbi*), corresponding to the western European allodium.

A peculiarity of State ownership of land was that the State itself exploited its tenants—the village communes (*jamâ'at-i dib*)—by means of finance officials (*ummâl*). In this case the notions of rent and tax coincided, and the rents or taxes (the land-tax, etc.), paid in cash and kind to the State by the tenants, were then distributed amongst the military caste as wages, pensions, subsidies, gifts, etc. The abundance of state-owned lands was a characteristic of Asiatic feudalism. In the time of the caliphate such land was absolutely predominant in Arab 'Irâq, in Egypt, and possibly in certain areas of Iran, but by no means in all. In Fârs for example privately-owned lands (*mulk*) prevailed until the tenth century.² After the Mongol conquest the area of the *Dîvân* lands greatly increased at first as a result of confiscations or the exter-

¹ By class is understood union on the basis of attitude towards production and by estate union on a legal basis.

² Ibn al-Balkhi, *Fârs-Nâma*, pp. 171-2; cf. Istakhri, p. 158.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

mination of the previous owners. But afterwards under the Īl-Khāns the greater part of these lands were converted into private property, unconditionally (*mulk*) or conditionally (*iqtā'*),¹ by means of payment, sale,² or seizure.

If the income of the Divān lands was spent on the upkeep of the State apparatus and the army, the income from *khāssā* properties (*injū*) was spent on the upkeep of the Īl-Khān, of his legal wives (*khatun*), of his sons, and of their residences (*ordu*). These lands were under the control of a special ministry—the *dīvān-i injū*. Often *injū* and state-owned lands were leased.³ Lands belonging to the ruling house (*injū*) were distinguished from lands belonging to the Īl-Khān himself (*injū-yi khāss, mulk-i pādshāh*).⁴ Rent coincided with tax in these lands also. By the term *injū* was understood not only the land, but also the people living on the land, both peasants and landowners, who were personally dependent on the Īl-Khān, his wives or sons, on the basis of commendation (Arabic *iltijā*) and patronage (Arabic *iljā, himāyat*).⁵

The *injū* land fund was composed of lands confiscated from the Iranian nobility after the Mongol conquest and of lands granted to members of the Īl-Khānid family by the previous owners.⁶ This fund was extremely large. The lands of Ghazan himself amounted to 20,000 *faddāns* (plough-strips),⁷ that is to 120,000–140,000 hectares of irrigated land. The *injū* land of Fārs district was leased for four years in 682/1292–3 for the sum of 10,000,000 dinārs, i.e. for 2,500,000 dinārs a year. If we consider that State taxes from Fārs (from *dīvān* and *mulk* land) were 2,871,200 dinārs,⁸ we can conclude that the *injū* lands of Fārs gave a slightly smaller income than all the remaining lands. According to the *Risāla-yi Falakiyya*, the overall income from the lands of the *khāssā* (*injū*) amounted to 12,434,220⁵ dinārs per annum.⁹

A certain kind of land mentioned in the sources was called *khālisāt* ("clean lands", i.e. those free of taxes payable to the *dīvān*). Nowadays in Iran the term signifies precisely lands belonging to the Divān or the State. But in the period under consideration, as is obvious from the

¹ See for more about this A. A. Alizade, *Zemel'naya Politika Ilkhānov*, pp. 5–23.

² Thus under Arghun, the governor of Rūm, Fakhr al-Din Ahmad Arkushī sold State land (*amlāk-i dīvāni*) to men of standing (*arbāb-i manāsiḥ*), and most of the land in Rūm became thereby *mulk* (*Tā'rikh-i Guzida*, p. 485).

³ Vassaf, pp. 231, 268, 317, 336, 404, etc.

⁴ See A. A. Alizade *K voprosu ob institute injū*, p. 98.

⁵ See Quatremère, *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, pp. 130–2, n. 12; Alizade, *op. cit.* pp. 95–108

⁶ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 479.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 268.

⁷ Vassaf, p. 349.

⁹ See above, p. 499.

THE CATEGORIES OF LANDOWNERSHIP

explanations of Vaṣṣāf and Rashīd al-Dīn,¹ this name was given to ruined and deserted land (*kharāb u bā’ir*) which was leased to landowner tenants (*tānī* pl. *tunnā’* in both authors) under a decree of Ghazan,² on condition that it was restored and occupied again, and that part of the *kharāj* was paid in the form of a share of the crop (*muqāsama*). Conditions of ownership were favourable to the tenants. These lands formed a separate part of the ruler’s lands (*khāṣṣa-yi pādshāhī*) under the administration of a special *dīvān-i kbālīṣāt* which made contracts with landowner tenants.

The character of the *vaqf* as an institution, and therefore of vaqf landowning also, suffered no change under the Il-Khāns. Inasmuch as the expenditure of *vaqf* income was limited by conditions laid down by legators, *vaqf* land may be regarded as a conditional form of feudal landowning. The income of owners of *vaqf* land did not only come from the exploitation of land and peasants, but also from canals, bazaars, shops, bathhouses, mills and other items of income which were leased for a money rent (Arabic *ijāra*). Owners of *vaqf* land paid nothing to the *Dīvān*, since they had tax immunity. The *vaqf* constituted the main source of income for dervish *shaikhs* and theologians. A whole body of religious persons and their servants lived on the income of each large *vaqf*, receiving from its curator (*mutavallī*) pensions (*marṣūmāt*) partly in money but mainly in kind (bread or grain, rice, meat, soap, cloths, etc.), as is shown by the list of expenditure of the *vaqf* set up by Ghazan in Baghdad.³ After the Mongol conquest many *vaqf* estates were seized by the “despoilers” (Arabic *mūtagħallibā*)—the Mongols. But under the Muslim Il-Khāns *vaqf* landownership expanded and formed a large part of the land fund.

By *mulk*, *milk*, or *arbābī* is meant a feudal institution completely analogous to the western European allodium: the full ownership by the landowner (*malik*) of land and water (channel or *kārīz*), unconditional and without obligation of service to the State, free to be sold and bequeathed. *Mulk* or *milk* denoted small-scale peasant landownership as well, providing the land did not belong to the commune. *Mulk* land as a rule paid land tax to the *dīvān* but mostly paid a tenth (Arabic ‘*ushr*’, Persian *dah-yak*) and not the *kharāj*. It is evident from the correspondence of Rashīd al-Dīn that the *arbābī* regions of İsfahān and

¹ Vassaf, pp. 349, 389, 445; *Jāmi‘ al-tawāriḵ*, ed. Alizade, pp. 556–9.

² *Ibid.* pp. 559–63.

³ *Mukātibāt-i Rasbīdi*, pp. 34–40 (no. 14).

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

Khūzistān were obliged to pay a tenth part of the harvest ('*usbr*) in kind (*bi-jins*).¹ But there were also "free" mulks (*mulk-i burri*) with fiscal immunity.²

Military fiefs were formally accounted a part of the State lands—*iqtā'*. But in fact they were a form of conditional private property, equivalent to the Western fiefs, with fiscal immunity and the transfer to the fief-holder (Arabic *muqta'*, Arabo-Persian *iqtā'-dār*) of the right to collect the taxes for himself. Thus tax was the same as rent on these lands and the land tax and other taxes benefited the *iqtā'-dār*. The feudal institution of the *iqtā'* had evolved from the tenth century, from the time of the Umayyads, up to the time of the Saljuqs. It changed from a peculiar kind of free benefice (a grant by the State to a member of the military caste of the right to collect for himself the *kharāj*, the '*ushr*', the *jizya* from a certain fixed territory great or small for the period of service or for life; in which case the taxes became rent) into a military fief or grant of land with the people on it, which was already usually hereditary in the tenth century.³ Under the Saljuqs the hereditary *iqtā'* had become the general rule, but this practice apparently only became established in law under Ghazan. From the time of the Saljuqs the *iqtā'* became the specific form of domination by the Turkish, and, from the thirteenth century, by the Mongol-Turkish nomad military aristocracy, of the Iranian farmers settled on the *iqtā'* lands.⁴

Under the Saljuqs *iqtā'* land was very common in Iran.⁵ Under the first six Īl-Khāns also *iqtā'* land was granted to the military,⁶ but not to all soldiers, the grants being mainly to the higher ranks. The mass of ranker soldiers, mostly nomads, received only wages in kind (grain), and some money under the name of *jāmagī*. Under Ghazan *iqtā'* fiefs were given to all Mongols who were warriors of the general levy, and according to Rashīd al-Dīn whole regions became *iqtā'* "in every *vilāyat*". Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī locates *iqtā'* land in Āzarbāijān, Arrān,

¹ *Mukāhibāt-i Rayḥāni*, pp. 33 (no. 13), 121–3 (no. 22).

² Nāṣir al-Dīn Ṭūsī, pp. 760–1.

³ See Cl. Cahen, *Évolution de l'iqtā' du IX au XIII siècle*.

⁴ Concerning the *iqtā'* and other categories of landownership in Iran under the Īl-Khāns see: B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1955), pp. 327–32; A. M. Belenitsky, "K voprosu o sotsial'nikh otnosheniakh v Irane v Hulaguidskuyu epokhu", *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, vol. V (1948), pp. 112–15; A. K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and Peasant in Persia* (London, 1953), pp. 53–104; A. A. Alizade, *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya istoria Azerbajajana v XIII–XIV vv.* (Baku, 1956), pp. 135–92; I. P. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie i agrarnye otnosheniya v Irane XIII–XIV vv.* (1960), pp. 232–83.

⁵ Rāvandī, pp. 130–1.

⁶ Juvainī, vol. I, p. 23; transl. Boyle, vol. I, p. 32.

THE CATEGORIES OF LANDOWNERSHIP

Shirvān and Khurāsān,¹ which is completely explained by the fact that the main summer (*yailaq*) and winter (*qışlaq*) camps of the Mongol and Turkish tribes forming the backbone of the Īl-Khānid army were there. Cultivated land with settled peasants near to nomad camps was given as *iqtā'*.

Ghazan's decree of the year 703/1303, dealing with the apportioning of *iqtā'* land amongst the Mongol levy, was formally an act of beneficence on the part of the Īl-Khān, but was in fact made necessary by the pressing importunity of the army, about which Rashid al-Dīn speaks. This explains the publication of this decree, which was in contradiction to the general centralizing policy of Ghazan and stimulated thereafter the growth of feudal distintegration. According to the decree, a certain fixed area was granted in fief to the amīr of a thousand, i.e. to the leader of a branch of the Mongol tribe who provided the army with a thousand horsemen. The amīr of a thousand divided this amongst the amīrs of hundreds by sortition (casting lots with a whip). In the same way amīrs of hundreds divided land amongst amīrs of tens, and these did likewise amongst the rankers. All of the soldiers received a large portion by right of *iqtā'*—a village or part of a village—and the amīrs received correspondingly more. The ownership of *iqtā'* was conditional upon doing military service; the *iqtā'* could be taken back upon execution of poor service. In accordance with the decree *iqtā'* lands were to be inherited, but not necessarily by the son, but by whomsoever of the family could best carry out military service. The sense of the decree indicates that taxes which were previously paid to the *divān* could now be collected as a right by the landowner himself (apart from a small tax of 50 mans of grain). Thus the possessor of *iqtā'* land had fiscal immunity but not administrative immunity. The inspector of the *divān* of the army—*bitikchīyi 'ārid*—was required every year to carry out an inspection of *iqtā'* lands and to take back the fiefs of those who had failed to do their military service or did not care to cultivate their land.² The decree gives the rights of fief-holder in respect of peasants living on the *iqtā'* lands.³ This decree firmly established the caste-hierarchical system of military fiefs.

Jalayirid charters (of Sultān Uvais) granting *iqtā'* to an amīr of a *tümen*,⁴ an amīr of a thousand, and a lower rank, possibly an amīr of a

¹ *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, pp. 82, 92, 93, 147.

² *Jāmi'i al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 508–17.

³ See below, pp. 522ff.

⁴ Military-administrative district capable of providing approximately 10,000 men.

hundred,¹ have come down to us. In these decrees there is also talk of the granting of a whole district to the complete control (*taṣarruf*) of a grantee. The terms *jāmagī* and *iqtā'* are here used as synonyms. Along with a clearly expressed fiscal immunity the *iqtā'-dār* also received the right of administrative immunity, with a prohibition against officials of the Dīvān entering upon immune territory, set apart (*mafrūz*) from the vilāyat and not subordinate to local authority.² Thus we have here a further evolution of the *iqtā'*.

Apart from the fiefs of the military nobility (*iqtā'*) there existed conditional grants of land and rent to members of the bureaucracy and the religious bodies. The grant for life or rent in kind (corn, barley, rice) or money was called *ma'išhat* (Arabic literally “livelihood”) and when granted into heredity (*maurūth*) or when it was “eternal” (*abadi*) it was called *idrār* (literally “pension”). Often such a grant was replaced by the grant of a village of the Dīvān, the income (= amount of taxes) from which equalled the sum of the *ma'išhat* or the *idrār*. This kind of grant was called the *muqāṣṣa* and was either for life (*muqāṣṣa-yi ma'išhat*) or for eternity (*muqāṣṣa-yi idrār*).³ It is clearly evident from the charters of Sultān Uvais that the owner of *muqāṣṣa* lands not only had fiscal immunity but also administrative immunity. The latter is expressed in the formula (which is met with in the charters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries): “Let them [the officials of the Dīvān] make brief and remove quills and feet”⁴ (that is, let them not carry on correspondence nor trespass on immune land).

Further development of the *iqtā'* led to the *soyurgħal* (Mong. literally “grant”—a military fief which appeared under the Jalayirids, was hereditary, and had fiscal and administrative immunity.⁵ After the middle of the fourteenth century the term *soyurgħal* had replaced *iqtā'*. The latter term is encountered thereafter from time to time in narrative sources as an archaic and bookish expression ordinarily signifying *soyurgħal*. The sources do not bear out the opinion expressed earlier that the *soyurgħal* was introduced into Iran by Timūr.

Pasture lands can be distinguished as a special category of land. The nomads—Mongol, Turkish, Lur and Arab—utilized it for their summer

¹ *Dastūr al-kātib*, ff. 182b–183b.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.* ff. 221b–223b; for more about the *idrār* see also Nāṣir al-Dīn Tūsī, p. 760; Juvainī, vol. II, p. 277; Vassaf, p. 453; *Mukātibāt-i Rasbīdī*, pp. 255–6 (no. 41).

⁴ *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 22b.

⁵ See: V. Minorsky, *A Soyurgħal of Qāsim Aq-Qāyūnlū*; A. M. Belenitsky, *K istorii feodal'nogo zemlevladeniya . . .*; I. P. Petrushevsky, “K istorii instituta soyurgāla”, *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, vol. VI (1949), pp. 227–46.

THE CATEGORIES OF LAND OWNERSHIP

camps in high mountainous regions and for their winter camps in the plains, with great distances between. Such pasture was normally designated by the terms *yurt* (Turkish) or ‘*alaf-khwār* (Arabo-Persian, literally “pasture”).¹

The *iqtā'*, soyurghal, or *yurt* could encompass territory great or small and could include the land of landowners lower in rank (e.g. the *iqtā'* land of an amīr of a thousand contained the lands of ranks subordinate to him). Both this system and the confusion of the concepts of state-owned land and the feudal estate which we find in the sources were in general typical of feudal societies with their hierarchic disintegrated form of property.

As we have said, private ownership, both conditional (*iqā'a*) and unconditional (*mulk*), greatly expanded at the expense of state-ownership under the last Īl-Khāns.² A general feature of this process was the concentration of land in the hands of great landowners. There were various ways in which this occurred: the granting of land by the Īl-Khāns, law-suits (in respect of land the title-deeds of which had been lost),³ purchase (*mulk*-land), and often straightforward seizure by the strong. The term *mutaghallib*, meaning “seizer of land”, is often met with in the documents of the period. Already under the first two Īl-Khāns the powerful Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Juvainī, taking advantage of his position, bought land (*mulk*) worth 40,000,000 dinārs. The greater part of the estates of Rashīd al-Dīn consisted of mulks which he bought in small pieces scattered about various regions. One supposes that this land was bought in separate lots from small landowners driven by ruin to sell their lands. The historian-minister also possessed deserted and neglected land (*zamīnhā-yi kharāb u bā'ir*), which he had taken on the basis of Ghazan's decree granting all such lands to those who would cultivate them.⁴ Lastly he derived income from vaqf lands of which he was the trustee (*mutawalli*).

From Rashīd al-Dīn's will it is evident that, beside those lands which he had given to his sons earlier, he intended to leave his sons and daughters, friends and trusted servants, 12,770 faddāns (plough-strips) of *mulk* ploughland, i.e. approx. 75–85,000 hectares of irrigated ploughland, and 39,000 date-palms in Arab ‘Irāq and the southern

¹ See Quatremère, *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, p. 137 n. 12: “The sultān ordered every tribe to be given an *iqtā'* and a ‘*alaf-khwār*.’”

² See Alizade, *Zemel'naya politika Īl-khanov*; see reference to sources there as well.

³ *Jāmi‘ al-tavārikh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 446–50.

⁴ *Mukātibāt-i Rayhānidī*, pp. 14 (no. 6), 21 (no. 9), 22–3 (no. 10), 180–1 (no. 33).

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

regions of Iran. As well as this he bequeathed to them an enormous number of gardens (1,200 men and women were slaves in but two of them near Tabriz), vineyards, 30,000 horses, 250,000 rams, 10,000 camels, and so on. Rashīd al-Dīn had elders of nomad tribes (*abs̄ham*) pasture his cattle and used to give his poultry and geese to dependent peasants (*dahāqīn*) to be fed.¹ The Īl-Khān Abū Sa‘īd presented the Shīrāzī qādī Majd al-Dīn Fālī with 100 settlements in the Fārs valley of Jamkān.²

THE PEASANTS UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

As is well known, Moslem law did not recognize serfdom and a special category of serfs. It knew only of free Muslims, *dhimmis* (*ahl al-dhimma*); the heterodox, Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians—who were personally free but had limited civil rights; and finally the slave,³ in principal a heterodox prisoner or the descendant of a heterodox prisoner. The taxable estate (*ra‘āya*)—peasants and townspeople—were formally regarded as personally free. *De facto* feudal dependence existed as a result of bondage to the soil, in virtue of which the State transferred populated land conditionally (*iqtā‘, vaqf*) or unconditionally (*mulk*) to the military caste and to the *faqīh*, together with the right to receive either wholly or in part the *kharāj* and other taxes, in which case tax became rent. Thus the relationship between the landowner and the peasant had the character not of personal but of territorial dependence. Niżām al-Mulk said that the *muqta‘* had no rights over the person (*tan*) of the peasant, nor over the members of his family, nor over his plot of land, nor over his household; he had only the right to collect the rent.⁴ Such was the formal legal position of the peasant. Things were of course different in practice. As early as the twelfth century the owners of *iqtā‘* land exercised legal and police powers over their peasants. The confusion of administrative and State functions with the rights of the landowner was a feature typical of both Western and Eastern feudalism.

¹ *Mukātibāt-i Rāshīdī*, pp. 224–40 (no. 36), 194–5 (no. 34), 53 (no. 17). See for more detail I. Petrushevsky, *Feodalnoe khozyaystvo Rashid ad-dīna*.

² Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, vol. II, p. 61.

³ In the period under consideration the words for slave were usually *ghulām*, *asīr* and *barda*. The terms ‘abd (Arabic) and *banda* (Persian) on the other hand were most often used in a different sense—“slave of God”, or “humble servant”. In the sources slaves are never confused with feudal bondsmen—the *ra‘iyat*.

⁴ *Siyāsat-Nāma*, ed. Schefer, p. 28; ed. Khaikhālī, p. 22.

THE PEASANTS UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

The self-government practised from ancient times by the village communes in Iran limited to an extent the arbitrary powers of the landowners and the financial officials in State lands. However, this communal self-government had begun to decay long before the Mongol conquest as a result of the inner stratification of the village commune already noticeable under the last Sassanians—the small landowners, the *dīghāns*, were then distinguished from the commune—and also as a result of the arbitrary practices of the financial officials and, after the Saljuq period, of the possessors of military fiefs. The village commune is rarely mentioned in the sources of the Mongol period and is usually called *jama'at-i dīh*, *jama'at-i qurā*, or *jama'at-i ahālī-yi dīhbā*.¹ However we did not chance upon any material descriptive of life in the commune in the sources, although we are told here and there of conflicts and law-suits between commune and landowner. We completely failed to find any mention of the periodic redistribution of land or about communal crop-rotation; it is evident that both had disappeared about the beginning of this period. The impression is created that the village commune was in a state of decline under the Mongols.

Before the thirteenth century we have no information that the feudal dependence of the peasants had taken the form of serfdom, with prohibition of travel. The binding of the peasants to the soil occurs apparently only after the Mongol conquest.² It was provoked primarily by the general economic decline of the country and by the catastrophic curtailment in the number of its inhabitants with the concomitant lack of workers and taxpayers on the land. There was now too much uncultivated and empty land and too few hands. In addition the fiscal policy of the conquerors and unbridled lawlessness on their part drove the peasants to mass flight.³ For these reasons the State and the feudal classes had a stake in prohibiting the right of movement of peasants and their forced return if they should flee. On the other hand the "Great Yasa" of Chingiz-Khān looked upon the dependence of the low-ranking Mongol warrior on his lord as a personal dependence. The Mongol warrior (*garachu*) was considered a serf and was attached, but of course not to the soil, for this would not make sense amongst nomads, but to

¹ See *Safwat al-safā*, ff. 184b, 192a–192b, 196a, 325a, 469a, 474b; *Mukātibāt-i Rasīdī*, p. 236 (no. 36); *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 51a.

² For more detail see I. Petrushevsky, *Zemledelie . . .*, pp. 324–39; references to sources and also literature on the question.

³ See *Jāmī's al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 458–9, 514; *Mukātibāt-i Rasīdī*, pp. 12 (no. 5), 146 (no. 27); Saifi, p. 464; Hāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Dhail-i Jāmī's al-tawārīkh*, p. 20; *Dastūr al-kātib*, ff. 119b 120a, 167a–167b, 177b, 183a, 198a–198b, 200a, 229a.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

the person of his hereditary lord, the nomad aristocrat. The Mongol conquerors attempted to extend this notion to include the Iranian ra‘iyat. The Yasa prohibited movement to another place under pain of death to “any man from a thousand, hundred, or ten”, and forbade the concealing of fugitives.¹ And although this law only applied to soldiers of the Mongol levy at first, it produced the feudal attachment of the ra‘iyat, in so far as the Yasa was extended to them² and in so far as the basis of the Yasa was the principle of universal attachment to the service of the State. The Armenian historian Grigor of Akner relates how tax-payers who had run away from the place of their registration were captured, bound and whipped without mercy.³ The Mongol view of the peasants as the personal property of the lord is recorded in a decree of Ghazan, in which it is clear that the fief-holders are speaking of their peasants: “They are given to us in the iqṭā‘, they are our slaves.”⁴ This is a confusion of slaves with the ra‘iyat, previously impossible and inadmissible in Muslim law.

The decree of Ghazan concerning the military fiefs or iqṭā‘ confirms the previously existing attachment of peasants to the soil. Peasants who had fled from inhabited and deserted villages granted as iqṭā‘ were ordered to return to their former habitations, unless thirty years had elapsed from the time of their flight, or unless they were included in the tax lists (*qānūn*) of other vilāyats. All were forbidden to shelter fugitive ra‘iyat.⁵ Another decree of Ghazan prohibited the further movement of peasants settled upon land.⁶ Thus attachment to the soil had spread to all peasants.

At the same time the decrees of Ghazan of the period after his conversion to Islam must be regarded as an attempt at judicial compromise between the Yasa of Chingiz-Khān and Muslim law. The right of movement of peasants was denied, but they were treated as free in law. It was emphasized that landowners should not move the peasants from village to village arbitrarily and they were forbidden to call them slaves. The peasants were not attached to the landowner but to the place of registration, to the tax list of a given area. This tendency to compromise between the Mongol Yasa and Muslim law is characteristic of the whole of Ghazan’s domestic policy. Of course the formal freedom of peasants was pure fiction in their actual situation without rights.

¹ Juvainī, vol. I, p. 24; trans. Boyle, vol. I, p. 32.

² *Ibid.* p. 25.

³ Grigor of Akner, ed. Blake and Frye, pp. 324–5.

⁴ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 514.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.* ed. Alizade, vol. III, p. 562.

THE PEASANTS UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

The attachment of peasants to the soil was also in existence under the Jalayirid sultans. Frequent orders for the search for peasants and their return to their former homes can be found in the documents collected in the *Dastūr al-kātib*.¹ One document mentions the return of fugitive *ra'iyyat* of the Hamadān vilāyat.² The reasons for flight given in these documents were the heaviness of the taxes, the arbitrary and illegal exactions of the local authorities, and sometimes the devastation of an area.

Quit-rent (*muzāra'a*) was the basic form of exploitation of the peasants in Iran both before and after the Mongol invasion. Peasants regarded as free in law depended on the landlord as tenants or subtenants, and in most cases hereditary tenants. The rent they paid was mostly feudal rent, a share of the crop, or in regions near to towns and there only, rent half in kind and half in money. The predominance of quit-rent was due to the fact that the landowners' own demesne was by and large absent from the economy. It is at least true that landlords did not possess, as a rule, their own grain-producing properties. Thus the peasants did not do the *corvée*. In so far as landowners still worked their own estates (gardens and virgin land—*bāqī*), they employed slave prisoners and not peasants.³

The five part division of the harvest between the landlord and the farmer (one part for the land, irrigation, draught animals, seed, and workmen) which exists at the present day is not mentioned in the medieval sources. Then also the share of the landowner (in other words, the feudal rent) varied according to local conditions and depended for its size on whether the tenant received from his landlord land only, or oxen, seed, and the benefits of his irrigation as well. The share of the landlord was designated by the term *bīssayi mālikī, babra-yi mālikāna*.⁴

In general there was not a clear distinction between this rent and taxes. Both were either paid wholly to the State, as was the case on the land of the *Divān* where tax and rent were one; or to the Īl-Khān and his family, if the land was *injū* land; or wholly to the landlord on *vaqfī, iqṭā', muqāṣṣa*, and *mulk-i burr* territory; or lastly income from

¹ See above p. 523, n. 2; see especially *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 229a (three documents).

² *Ibid.* the first document.

³ *Mukāribāt-i Rāshīdī*, pp. 53 (no. 17), 236 (no. 36); *Jāmi' al-tawāriḵk*, ed. Alizade, p. 513: "Let virgin land be worked by their slaves oxen, teams of draught animals, and with their seed."

⁴ *Vāṣṣāf*, p. 630; *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 151b.

IRAN UNDER THE İL-KHĀNS

land would be divided between the State as tax and the landlord as rent in fixed proportion on mulk and *khalisāt* land. What was this proportion? We have but little information on this point. We see from the tax regulations of *Khūzistān* that the *Divān* took 60 per cent of the harvest on state-owned land and 10 per cent from arbābī or mulk land in kind.¹ Assuming that the same amount was paid by the tenant on the latter land as on the former, we may conjecture that the land-owner derived 50 per cent after the State's 10 per cent (*dab-yak*) had been paid to the *divān*, and that the peasant kept 40 per cent of his crop. We can suppose that the same applies to the *Īsfahān* vilāyat where the *divān* took 10 per cent.² On *khalisāt* land in Arab Iraq however the tenant (*tāni*) had one-third of the crop, one-third was paid to the *divān*, and the subtenant farmer (*barzgar*) kept one-third for himself.³

Money rent existed in suburban regions near to large towns (money rent on land—*ijāra*); auxiliary forms of rent were the labour rent and rent in kind. Labour rent signified the forced labour of the *ra'iyyat* on behalf of the State or their landlords and consisted of irrigation work such as the digging of channels and kārīz and their periodic cleansing,⁴ building work such as the construction of houses, palaces, fortress walls, etc.,⁵ and the clearing of woodland for the plough in the lands near the Caspian.⁶ The words used for this labour rent were *bigār*, *shigār*, and *bašar*.

The terms *akkār*, *muzāri*, and *barzgar* meaning "farmer, sower", as the sources show, took on the sense of quit-rent tenant. The economic unit was *juft-i gāv*, literally a "team of oxen" (synonyms were *faddān*, *zanj*, and *pāgāv*). This term had a twofold technical sense: (1) a team of oxen together with light or heavy plough and ploughmen, the team often consisting of several pairs of beasts and sometimes as many as twelve; (2) a strip of land for ploughing which could be worked by one team in one season. The size of the *juft* or *faddān* varied in different

¹ *Mukātabāt-i Rāshidī*, pp. 121–3 (no. 22).

² *Ibid.* pp. 33–4 (no. 13).

³ *Nuzhat al-qulub*, p. 31; instead of بزرك بازي and تانی بزرگ as in the edition of le Strange, should be تانی بزرگ and بازي بزرگ.

⁴ *Mukātabāt-i Rāshidī*, pp. 244–45 (no. 38; *Rāshidī* gathered together 20,000 *ra'iyyat* from Jazireh, Rūm, and Armenia in order to dig a canal), 246–7 (no. 39); compare *Rashbahāt ayn al-hayāt*, p. 227 (3,000 peasants from the estates of *Khwāja Ahrār* sent to clean channels).

⁵ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 558; Kirakos transl. Brosset, p. 193; Saifī, pp. 440, 444, 739–472; cf. Juvainī, vol. I, p. 20.

⁶ *Zāhir al-Dīn Mar'ashi*, p. 413.

THE PEASANTS UNDER THE İL-KHĀNS

regions but an average would possibly be 6–7 hectares.¹ The juft normally included several peasant farms and served as the unit of taxation of the peasants.² It was a unit for fixing the returns—the injü estates of Ghazan in Fārs were leased at 61 dinārs and 4 dāngs per annum from each faddān³ and also as the unit for the distribution of compulsory labour amongst the peasants.⁴

The official acts rarely touch upon the condition of the peasants on privately owned estates and give meagre information. This is understandable since the State regarded the relationship between the peasant and his malik as the private affair of the latter; narrative sources rarely mention this subject. On the other hand we possess much information from the most varied sources concerning the condition of the peasants on injü and Divān land, and they all paint a dark picture. Ḥamd Allāh Qazvīnī gives us to understand that the position of the peasant was better on the estates of the private landowners (*arbāb*), and that they took care to preserve their own property. Managers of Divān and waqf land, in which there was a rapid turnover, were in a hurry to get rich, and did not worry about the prosperity of their estates, with the result that they ruined them.⁵ The poet Nīzārī in the seventies of the thirteenth century saw an estate (privately owned) in Kūhistān which had been deserted because of the oppression of a tyrant landlord.⁶ The same poet gives the following description of the practice of collecting tax in kind (wine) in the same province. The tax collector (*mūhaṣṣil*) arrived at the village of Baidan and presented the elder (*mihtar-i dīb*) with an assignation (*barāt*) on 100 mans of wine. The elder announced that his village was ruined and that he did not have a single man of wine. He was given 200 blows with a stick, which only ceased when the hidden jars of wine were discovered.⁷ Rāshid al-Dīn, speaking about the mass flight of peasants from their villages, continues: “When the tax collectors went around the locality, they found some villain or other who knew the houses, and at his direction discovered the people in corners, cellars, gardens, and ruins. If they could not find the men, they seized their wives. Driving them before them like a flock of sheep,

¹ See for calculations I. Petrushevsky, *Feodalnoe khozyaystvo Rashid ad-dīna*, pp. 90–3; references and literature on the question.

² *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 151 b.

³ *Vassâf*, p. 349.

⁴ *Rashabāt ‘ayn al-bayāt*, pp. 227–8; *Silsilat an-nasab-i Safaviya*, pp. 113–14.

⁵ *Tārikh-i Guzida*, pp. 485–6.

⁶ *Dastūr-Nāma*, ed. Bertel’s, pp. 65–6, *Vostochnii sbornik*, vol. 1 (1918).

⁷ *Dastūr-Nāma*, pp. 67–8.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

they brought them to the tax officials who had them hung up on ropes so that the wails and plaints of the women rose up to the heavens.”¹ The same author relates that one of the landowners (*mallāk*) arrived at his village in Firūzābād in the region of Yazd to collect the rent and could find neither elder nor peasant: they had all fled. On the other hand he saw seventeen tax collectors, come with barāts to be met from the taxes of the village. They had managed to capture three *ra’iyat* who had hidden in the steppe. They brought them back to the village and hung them on ropes to force them to tell where the other peasants were hidden, but they discovered nothing.² *Rashīd al-Dīn* wrote to his son Maḥmūd, governor of Kirmān, about the poverty-stricken condition of the peasants of the province of Bam, ruined and in flight because of the extortion and violence practised by the military.³ Rent and taxes not only devoured a great part of the peasant’s crops, but were often more than the peasant could pay, so that arrears (*baqāyā*)⁴ mounted from year to year, and the peasant remained an eternal debtor. Tax-farming did more than a little to ruin the peasants, and this practice, called *muqāṭa’ā* or *damān*, remained in existence after the reign of Ghazan.⁵ Tax-farmers were mainly nomad aristocrats,⁶ local landlords, officials or moneylenders attempting to get as much out of the *ra’iyat* as possible, and not caring if they drove them to total ruin. *Rashīd al-Dīn* and Vassāf give us much information concerning the malpractices and exactions of the tax-farmers.⁷ The fiscal system established by the Mongols and tax-farming were primary reasons for the calamitous situation of the *ra’iyat*, particularly the settled peasants, almost the majority of whom were on the verge of penury previous to Ghazan’s reforms. The lawlessness and violence of the feudal lords, first and foremost, of the Mongol-Turkish nomad nobility and the military caste down to its lowest ranks, were causes no less important.⁸ These are typified by the remarks of Ghazan, that “in the eyes of the governors and others even clods of earth call forth esteem, but the *ra’iyat* do not” that “the rubbish on the roads was not trodden underfoot as were the *ra’iyat*”, and that the Iranian *ra’iyat* were so demeaned and terrorized,

¹ *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, p. 458.

² *Ibid.* p. 460.

³ *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, pp. 10–11 (no. 5).

⁴ Juvainī, vol. II, pp. 223, 244, etc.; transl. Boyle, vol. II, pp. 487, 507–8.

⁵ *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, p. 269 (no. 45).

⁶ *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 453, 468.

⁷ *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 448–53, 468–476; Vassāf, pp. 231, 268–298–9, 302–3, 404, 436–9.

⁸ *Jāmi’ al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 478–9, 567–9.

THE PEASANTS UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

that were a fly to steal their bread, they would not dare oppose it.¹ These words show clearly the contrast between the fiction of freedom in law (in accordance with Moslem law) and the actual unprivileged and depressed position of the *ra'iyyat*.

THE FISCAL SYSTEM UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

The fiscal system, like the whole Mongol system of government, was a monstrous and self-contradictory combination of methods introduced by the nomad conquerors (partly influenced by China—taxation per head of the population) and ancient Iranian traditions kept up by the 'Abbāsid caliphate. The Mongol fiscal system has attracted the attention of a number of investigators.² Nevertheless the meaning of certain terms used in taxation and the nature of the taxes they designated are still very often unclear and have not been determined. This is explained by the insufficiency and in some cases the vagueness of the sources, and also by the fact that one and the same term had a different meaning at different times and in different regions. The latter circumstance is evidently to be explained by the fact that the different areas had dissimilar fiscal regulations and traditions, whilst the tendency of Moslem lawyers to consider the tax system as a unified whole inclined them to use a common terminology for taxes that differed at times in various districts.

The sources mention about 45 terms for taxes and obligations of the Īl-Khān period that survived in part into the following period. Some of these terms are however synonyms. The majority of them were known before the Mongols, under the Saljuqs or even earlier. The tax system of the Mongols nonetheless weighed much more heavily upon the population of Iran than the fiscal systems of earlier epochs. This was because of the high, inexactly ascertained rates of tax and the arbitrary methods of collection practised by the authorities, and not because of the imposition of new taxes. (*Rashid al-Dīn* and *Vassaf* note the practice of exacting one and the same tax several times in one year or exacting it several years in advance.) A final reason for this was the fact that a

¹ *Jāmi' al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, pp. 469, 477.

² Besides the well-known work of d'Ohsson and the notes of Quatremère on his *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, see V. V. Barthold, *Persidskaya nadpis' na stene aniiskoi mechetii Manuchie*; V. Minorsky, *A Soyūrghāl . . .*; V. Minorsky, *Fārs in 881 = 476*; B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, pp. 306–35; 'Abbās Iqbāl, *Tā'rikh-i muqāṣṣal-i Irān*, vol. 1, pp. 285–307; A. K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and peasant in Persia*, pp. 102–4; A. A. Alizade, *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Azerbaidzhana XIII–XIV vv.*, pp. 198–253; I. P. Petrushevsky, *Zemledeliye i agrarnye otnosheniya v Irane XIII–XIV vv.*, pp. 340–402 (ch. VIII).

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

ruined country could not bear such a tax burden. The burden was made more heavy by tax-farming and by covering State expenditure with assignations (*barāt*, *bavāla*), payment of which was imposed on the *ra'iyyat*. Whilst it is true that both practices existed under previous rulers, they greatly expanded under the Mongols, and Ghazan's fiscal policy was only a palliative. The whole weight of the tax burden fell of course on the peasant *ra'iyyat*, and the lower and middle ranks of the town dwellers; the upper classes—"the people of the sword" and the "people of the pen" were either free from taxes or passed them on to the quit-rent peasants of their estates.

The main tax before the Mongol conquest was, as is known, the *kharāj*—the land tax. A new tax came into existence alongside it in the Mongol period, and in some cases replaced the *kharāj*. This was the *qubchur*. As Quatremère has shown,¹ the *qubchur* was at first only a tax on pasture land. *Qubchur* kept its original technical meaning of one out of every 100 head of cattle or 1 per cent amongst the Mongols under the Īl-Khāns,² from which it is evident that taxes paid by the nomads remained insignificant. But shortly after the Mongol conquest the Mongol authorities began to use the word *qubchur*, a term familiar to them, to designate the basic direct tax paid by town and country dwellers. Thus the *qubchur* meant two basically distinct taxes: the 1 per cent paid by the nomads; and the tax on the settled population, which, as can be seen from Juvainī and Rashid al-Din, was paid in money even after Ghazan's reforms, and must have been very difficult for the peasants to pay, since they had to sell their grain to raise the money. The nature of the *qubchur* remains far from clear. The opinion has been expressed that the *qubchur* paid by the settled population corresponds to the *kharāj*, but this has not been proved, as is shown by Minorsky.³ It has also been shown that in some areas only one of the taxes was collected—the *qubchur* in one, the *kharāj* in another.⁴ Indeed Rashid al-Din mentions "qubchur regions" (*vilāyat-i qubchūrī*);⁵ in other vilāyats, for example Khuzistān, only the *kharāj* was exacted.⁶ But there were regions like Fārs where both the *qubchur* and the *kharāj* were paid.⁷ It is not known what the basis of the distinction was.

¹ See Quatremère, *op. cit.* p. 256 n. 83; compare B. Vladimirtsov, *Obschestvennyi stroi mongolov*, p. 112.

² Nasîr al-Dîn Tûsî, p. 761; *Dastûr al-kâtib*, ff. 201b, 226a.

³ *A Sayîrghâl of Qasim Aq-Qoyunlu*, p. 935 n. 2.

⁴ A. A. Alizade, *op. cit.* p. 204.

⁵ *Jâmi' al-tawârikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 461.

⁶ *Mukâtabât-i Rashîdî*, pp. 122-3 (no. 22).

⁷ Vâssâf, p. 347.

THE FISCAL SYSTEM UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

From information given by Naṣir al-Dīn Ṭūsī,¹ we can see that the qubchur was a poll tax under Hülegü (and evidently later) and that it was imposed on all subjects first of all by the Mongols contrary to Muslim law, which exempted the Mohammedans. The qubchur was graded according to the property of the tax-payer, and its rate changed often.² Rashid al-Dīn relates that the qubchur was usually farmed out, and that there were governors who took 10 times, and even 20 or 30 times the qubchur from the ra‘iyat of their vilāyats (the latter being evidently an exaggeration).³ Qubchur returns under Ghazan are not known. One can deduce from the decree of Ghazan only that the overall sum from each district was ascertained on the basis of fixed estimated expenditure (*ikbrajāt-i muqarrari*) and was then divided amongst the ra‘iyat on the basis of previous tax lists.⁴ The term *qubchur* disappears from documents under the Jalayirids, but the tax itself—poll tax, paid by Muslims as well—was still in existence later under the name of *sar-shumāra* or *sarāna*.

As we have already said, the *kharāj* was mostly collected in kind as part of the crop (the ancient *mugāsama*) in the Īl-Khānid period, but it was paid in cash⁵ on a measured area (the ancient *misāba*) in the country-side near to such towns as Baghdad and Shirāz. The rate of the tax was not the same in each vilāyat. In one of Ghazan’s decrees the part of the crop given by the peasant to the Divān (*kharāj*) was fixed at 1/3 to 1/4.⁶ But in Khūzistān, as we have said, the *kharāj* from state-owned land was fixed during the reign of Ghazan at 6/10 of the crop. In one Jalayirid document the rate of the *kharāj* is stipulated as 2/10 of the harvest in kind (*babra*), “according to the custom of the vilāyat”.⁷ Apart from the basic *kharāj* (*asl-i kharāj* or simply *asl*) there was also an additional sum—*far’*.⁸ The *far’* was supposed to be 1/10 of the basic *kharāj*, according to Vaṣṣāf, and from 1/10 to 2/10, according to Naṣir al-Dīn Ṭūsī.⁹ The terms *asl-i kharāj* and *far’* were known long before the Mongol conquest.¹⁰

The tithe (‘*us̄hr* or *dahyak*), in other words the lands tax at the

¹ Naṣir al-Dīn Ṭūsī p. 763.

² Juvainī, vol. II, pp. 254, 256, 261; trans. Boyle, vol. II, pp. 517, 517, 524.

³ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 453.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 462.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 472–3.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 551.

⁷ *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 199b.

⁸ Vaṣṣāf, pp. 438, 439.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 435; Naṣir al-Dīn Ṭūsī, p. 762.

¹⁰ Firdausi, *Šāh-Nāma*, ed. Mohl, vol. VII, p. 502 (chapter 50, verse 899); cf. Rāvandī, p. 32.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

alleviated rate of 1/10 of the crop in kind,¹ was exacted from privately owned lands (*mulk, arbābī*)² under the Īl-Khāns. Apparently this was a special privilege of the landowners. It did not apply to peasants paying quit-rent, who had to pay rent to landlords (*babra-yi mālikāna*), as well as 'ushr to the divān.

The sources give conflicting information on the *qalan*, which is evidently explained by the fact that it signified different taxes and duties at different times and in different places. Grigor of Akner and Rashid al-Din speak of the *qalan* as a kind of military service. But the table of taxes of Khūzistān show it to be the upkeep of the military aristocracy (amirs) during their tours and military expedition,³ whilst the amount raised by the *qalan* was a meagre 1,200 dinārs from the whole of Khūzistān, compared with the total tax from the region of 325,000 dinārs.⁴ But the thirteenth-century Persian poet Pūr-i Bahā, in a *qasīda* in honour of the historian and administrator 'Alā' al-Dīn Juvainī speaks of the *qalan* and the *qubchur* as the two main taxes that bore heavily and with ruinous effect upon the population.⁵ We conclude from this that the term *qalan* was here used in place of *kharāj*.

Earlier we mentioned the tax that the Mongols introduced for the first time, the *tamgha*, which was paid on all forms of trade and urban crafts, even prostitution,⁶ and which replaced the Moslem *zakāt* at the rate of 2·5 per cent. (There is no mention of *zakāt* in documents of the thirteenth century and after.) The rate of the *tamgha* is not known exactly. But from the letter of Rashid al-Dīn to his spiritual counsellor Sadr al-Dīn Turkā'i⁷ we can conclude that the rate was 10 per cent of the value of each commercial transaction originally, and that Ghazan cut it by half in some towns and in other towns abrogated it for a period (for example, in the towns of Khūzistān).

The term '*avārid*' meant a special tax to cover extraordinary expenses, but was in fact regularly imposed and was extremely ruinous.⁸ We can

¹ Concerning the origin and original character of the '*ushr*' see A. N. Poliak, *Classification of Lands . . .*, pp. 40–62; F. Lokkegaard, *Islamic Taxation*, pp. 72–91.

² At least from all private estates in Khūzistān and the Isfahān *vilāyat*; see the *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, pp. 33–4 (no. 13), 121–3 (no. 22); cf. *Rashībat 'ayn al-hayāt*, p. 227.

³ *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, pp. 122–3.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ See V. Minorsky, *Pūr-i Bahā and his poems*, pp. 194–7 (Persian text), 198–200 (English translation), especially verse two:

“The whole world has become scattered and homeless
Because of the immense *qalan* and endless *gopčur*.”

⁶ *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 227a.

⁷ *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, p. 34 (no. 13).

⁸ See Vaṣṣāf, p. 197; *Mukātibāt-i Rashīdī*, p. 28 (no. 11).

THE FISCAL SYSTEM UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

judge its character from a tale of Saifī. In 716/1317 the governor of Khurāsān, the Amīr Yasa'ul, desiring to organize a celebration in honour of his daughter on the occasion of her marriage with the son of Prince Yasa'ur, imposed 'avāriq of 300,000 dīnārs on the rā'iyyat of Khurāsān, 50,000 of which were to be paid by Herāt. Two *nā'ibs* with fifty horsemen, arriving in Herāt on the day of the Festival of the Sacrifice ('īd-i qurbān), drove the inhabitants out of the mosque with sticks, and laid 100 to 200 dīnārs tax on all whom they caught and bound. They extorted it on the spot, beating and torturing, wounding and making invalids of about 200 citizens. By sunset they had collected 50,000 dīnārs.¹ 'Avāriq was already resorted to under Maḥmūd of Ghazna.²

The words '*alafa*' and '*ulūfa*' (lit. fodder, forage) signified a collection in kind to provide food and fodder for the military caste and the army in a given district. According to the sources, this exactation consisted of grain, straw, oxen, sheep, poultry, wine, and sometimes money. In 707/1307 the general Muḥammad Sām demanded 500 *kharvārs* of grain, 500 rams, 50 horses, 30 slaves (*barda*) and 10,000 dīnārs for his army from the vassals of the lord of Herāt.³ The *taghār* was the same tax, but in a narrower sense, being only paid in grain, at the rate of 100 mans (= 1 *kharvār*, or ass load).

The general poll-tax (*sar-shumāra*, *sarāna* = *qubchur*) introduced by the Mongols, which we have already mentioned, must not be confused with the ancient poll-tax based on Moslem law, exacted from the non-Moslems—the *jizya*. After the Mongol conquest the *jizya* ceased to exist. Ghazan restored the *jizya* paid by the heterodox (October 1295) after his conversion to Islam, but quickly abolished it (1296)⁴ because of the intercession of the Nestorian patriarch Mar Yabalaha III, an Uighur by birth (1281–1317). But in 1306 the *jizya* was restored again by Öljeitü, and this time for good.⁵ Under Sultān Uvais the *jizya* paid by Christians and Jews (men only) was 8 dīnārs from the rich, 6 from those of middle condition, and 4 from the poorer people.⁶ It is not clear whether the *jizya* was paid by the heterodox instead of the *sar-shumāra*, or together with it. In some districts *khāna-shumāra*⁷ (i.e. tax paid by household or family) was exacted in place of *sar-shumāra*.

Tax on gardens was paid in fruit—*bāgh-shumāra*⁸—and was evidently

¹ Saifī, p. 649.

² Nizāmī-y 'Arūdī Samarqandī, p. 18.

³ Saifī, p. 522.

⁴ Mar Yabalaha, pp. 115–16.

⁵ Ibid. p. 149.

⁶ *Dastūr al-kālib*, f. 220a.

⁷ Ibid. ff. 225a–225b.

⁸ Ibid.

IRAN UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

identical with the *thamārāt* (fruit).¹ This tax derives from the time of Khusrav I Anushirvān, who laid a tax on fruit trees.²

Increases in the *kharāj* and other taxes were reflected in the terms *tafāvut* (difference), *taufīr* (increase),³ *zavā'id* (excess), and *nemeri* (Mongol: addition).⁴ Details and rates of these taxes are not specified more exactly.

The term *ikhrājāt* (lit. expenditure), frequently encountered in the sources, evidently referred to the whole group of circumstantial and permanent taxes paid by the *ra'iyyat* to cover the cost of officials touring the latters' districts (*ikhrājāt-i ṣādir u vārid*).⁵ Expenditure covered by estimates (*muqarrari*) was distinguished from expenses beyond the estimates (*khārijiyat*). The following taxes evidently belonged to the group: *haqq al-taqrir* (synonym—*rasm al-vizāra*)—as we see from the correspondence of Rashid al-Din;⁶ a tax in kind (grain, sugar, etc.) for the support of the Grand Vazir: *rasm al-sadāra* (*haqq al-taulīyya*)—a tax collected from the *ra'iyyat* of vaqf lands for the Grand Sadr at the rate of 10 per cent;⁷ *rusūm-i shahmagī* or *dārūghākī*—a tax for the governor of a province (*shahna*, *darugha*, *basqaq*); *rusūm-i 'ammāl* (*rasm-i khazāna*, Arabic-Persian)—a tax for the upkeep of officials of the Exchequer (*khazāna*, *bait al-māl*), fixed at 2 out of every 100 dīnārs tax from the time of Ghazan;⁸ *haqq at-taḥṣīl* ("share of the tax")—for the tax collector (*mubaṣṣil*, *taḥṣīldār*);⁹ and *harz*—a tax at the preliminary estimate of a crop, and similar taxes.

The term *tarb* signified the compulsory sale of products by the *ra'iyyat* to the Exchequer or local ruler at prices much below market value, and the compulsory purchase by the *ra'iyyat* of goods lying in government stores at prices far beyond that value. The meaning of the term is explained by A. A. Alizade.¹⁰

¹ Vassaf, p. 439, مال و خراج ثمره; *Mukātibāt-i Rašīdī*, pp. 121 ff., is the reading of Professor Muhammad Shafī'; the manuscript had نمارات.

² Tabarī, ser. 1, pp. 960–2; Th. Noeldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber* . . . , pp. 244–5 n.

³ This term was already known in the eleventh century, see the *Siyāsat-Nāma*, p. 209.

⁴ Vassaf, p. 326; also mentioned in the Ani inscription.

⁵ Juvaini, vol. I, p. 23; Vassaf, p. 339; *Dastūr al-kātib*, ff. 112a, 201a–201b, 221b, 225a–229a. (All the documents granting immunity shown here speak of liberation from the *ikhrājāt* as well as other taxes.)

⁶ *Mukātibāt-i Rašīdī*, pp. 236–7 (no. 36), 243 (no. 37).

⁷ *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 213a.

⁸ *Jāmi' al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, vol. III, pp. 540–41. ⁹ *Dastūr al-kātib*, f. 206b.

¹⁰ A. A. Alizade, *Termin tarb*, pp. 109–13; there also references to sources; in particular there is the story from Vassaf (p. 363) about how, at a time of famine in Fārs, the *ra'iyyat* were ordered to provide the Exchequer with a *tarb* of corn at 6 dīnārs per *kharvār*, when the market price was 30 dīnārs per *kharvār*.

THE FISCAL SYSTEM UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

“Presents” from the *ra‘iyat* to the *Īl-Khān*, to members of his family, to dignitaries, and to the local feudalists (Persian *pīshkash*, Mongol *sa’uri*, Turkish *tuzghu*) were obligatory upon their arrival in a district, or upon the occasion of some festivity, and their proportions were established. Thus one of Ghazan’s decrees states that a wine-skin of fruit-juice should contain 50 Tabrīz mans in payment of *sa’uri* to the residence of *Īl-Khān*, whilst a wine-skin of fruit-juice given on the occasion of a festivity should hold 40 mans.¹

The gathering of *ra‘iyat* for forced labour has already been mentioned. It was one of their heaviest duties. No less heavy for them was the obligation to billet (Arabic *nuzūl*, Turkish *qonalgħa*)—the duty of taking into their houses the innumerable messengers, amīrs, military persons, and officials, together with their staffs, and then to feed and entertain them. According to Rashid al-Dīn, every *basqaq* who toured a region with his staff occupied at least a hundred houses at one time. “In every neighbourhood”, he says, “where a messenger decided to stay, the inhabitants were immediately subjected to constraint, since his slaves and military servants lowered themselves into neighbouring courtyards from the flat roofs, and stole whatever their eyes fell on. They shot their arrows at pigeons and chickens, and often hit children. Whatever they found that was eatable or drinkable or could be fed to their cattle, no matter to whom it belonged, they stole for themselves.”² Since the messengers were arriving all the time, when one left a house, another would be billeted in it the very same day. “Every year”, relates Rashid al-Dīn, “under various pretexts messengers took away several thousand cows, bedding, cauldrons, pots and utensils belonging to the inhabitants. They stabled saddle animals and beasts of burden in the gardens, and in one day would ruin a garden which was the product of ten years’ work and a thousand difficulties overcome.”³ Ghazan abolished the right to billet in the houses of the *ra‘iyat* and ordered the construction of special government hostelries. But already by the time of the *Īl-Khān* Abū Sa‘id the obligation to billet had appeared yet again. We can ascertain this from the fact that the reason for the uprising of the Sarbadārs in Khurāsān (737/1337) was the unbridled licence of a Mongol messenger who stopped for lodging at the village of Bāshtin and demanded wine and a woman. Under Sultān Uvais decrees were again issued to forbid billeting in the houses

¹ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh*, ed. Alizade, p. 499.

² *Ibid.* p. 460.

² *Ibid.* p. 564.

IRAN UNDER THE İL-KHĀNS

of the *ra'iyyat*.¹ Of course the obligation to billet existed in Iran before the Mongol conquest,² but never before did it assume such proportions of national disaster as it did under the Mongols, according to *Rashid al-Dīn*, when many of the *ra'iyyat* deliberately kept their houses in a delapidated condition, which however did not always help.

The carriage duty (Turkish *ulagh*)—the obligation of the *ra'iyyat* to provide animals for riding and carrying on the postal service (*barid*, Turkish *yam*)—was already in existence at the time of the caliphate. But only in the Mongol period do the sources describe it as a national calamity.

"It is impossible to calculate", says *Rashid al-Dīn*, "how many asses the *ulagh* took each year from the *ra'iyyat*, the merchants, and others, and how many thousands of *ra'iyyat* had their heads, arms, and legs broken by the messengers. The *ra'iyyat* were all the time wandering about in search of their animals, taken from them for government transport, and did not know what to do. Some of their animals had been driven away for good, and were not returned. Others were left by the roadside to die; and the *ra'iyyat* neglected the farms and their work."³

Such were in general the system of taxes and obligations and its terminology under the İl-Khāns. We shall not dwell here upon a number of fiscal terms which are insufficiently clear. Taxes and obligations not based on Moslem law (that is, apart from the *kharāj*, '*ushr*, *jizya*, and *zakāt*) were covered by the term *takālīf*, *taklīfāt-i dīvānī*.⁴ But beside these there were taxes arbitrarily fixed by local authorities, denoted in the sources by the terms *shiltāqāt* (Arabicized plural of the Mongol *shiltaq*, pretext (for extortion) and *shānāqīs* (plural of Arabic *shāngāṣa*—synonym of *istiqṣā*)—"draining to the uttermost, exhausting utterly").⁵

The system of taxes and services of the İl-Khān state was without a doubt based on the merciless exploitation of the settled working population by both the state and the feudal leadership connected with it. The scale of feudal rent and taxation was completely out of proportion with the economic development of the country. Attempts to

¹ *Dastūr al-kātib*, ff. 50b, 166b–168b.

² *Ibn al-Athīr*, vol. xi, p. 180; *Rāvandī*, pp. 33, 513 (note of the editor on the term *nuzūla*).

³ *Jāmi‘ al-tawārīkh*, ed. Alizade, p. 556; cf. *ibid.* pp. 479–83.

⁴ See *Khwāndamīr*, *Habib al-siyar*, vol. iii, pt. 4, p. 21, where there is an abridgement of the decree of Sultān Ahmād Aq-Qoyunlu (902/1497) abolishing the taxes *takālīf-i dīvānī* and *ikhrājāt-i shiltāqāt*, by reason of their not being based on Moslem law.

⁵ See *Rāvandī*, p. 507 (editor's note on the word *shāngāṣa*).

THE FISCAL SYSTEM UNDER THE ĪL-KHĀNS

reform this system and make it less hard on the peasants and town dwellers—under Ghazan and the early Jalayirids—gave but temporary and relative periods of economic revival. In sum, this system, together with the general ruin of the period of the Mongol conquest, was the main factor in the inability of Iran to regain the level that it had reached by the beginning of the thirteenth century. High rates of feudal rent and tax were the chief causes of the popular uprisings in Iran.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER 5

Bibliographical information is given throughout the notes to this chapter. Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *Order of Assassins* (discussed in note 1 on p. 423), has been translated into Persian by Faridūn Badrā'i as *Firqa-yi Ismā'īliyya* (Tabriz, 1964). The translator had trouble finding the exact equivalent of the English wording, and some of his *bijrī* dates are merely from a date-table and so incorrect, but he worked conscientiously and has made precisionis in some details. See now also Bernard Lewis, *The Assassins* (London, 1967).

CHAPTER 6

ABBREVIATIONS

B.G.A.	<i>Bibliotheca geographorum Arabicorum.</i>
B.S.O.A.S.	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.</i>
G.M.S.	Gibb Memorial Series.
E.I.	<i>Encyclopaedia of Islam.</i>
H.S.	Works issued by the Hakluyt Society.
Z.D.M.G.	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.</i>
S.S.I.A.	<i>Sbornik statei po istorii Azerbajijana</i> , Baku.
L.	Leningrad.
M.	Moscow.
SPb	St Petersburg.

Primary sources

- Abū Bakr al-Quṭbī al-Aḥrī. *Ta'rīkh-i Shaikh Uwais*. Ed. and tr. J. B. van Loon. The Hague, 1954.
- Aflākī, Afdāl ad-Dīn. *Aflaki, Maqaqib al-arifin*. Cl. Huart, *Les saints des derviches tourneurs*, vol. I, 1918 (Fr. transl.).
- Barbaro, Josafa. *Travels to Tana and Persia*. Ed. Lord Stanley of Alderley... Hakluyt series, vol. 49, part I. London, 1873.
- Burhān-i Qātī. *Kitāb-i Burhān-e Qātī‘ ta’lif-i Muhammād Ḥusain*. Calcutta, 1233/1818 (Pers.).
- Ch’ang-ch’un. *Si Yu-tsy, puteshestvie na Zapad*. Perevod s primechaniyami arkhimandrita Palladia Kafarov. Trudy chlenov Russkoi dukhovnoi missii v Pekine, vol. IV. SPb, 1866.
- Chao Ju-kua, *His Work of the Chinese Trade in the XII and XIII Centuries...* Tr. E. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill. SPb, 1912.
- Clavijo, R. G. *Dnevnik puteshestvya ko dvoru Timura* (“Diary of a visit to the court of Timur”). Ed. I. I. Sreznevsky. SPb, 1881. (Spanish text and Russian tr.)
- Dastūr al-kātib*. See Muḥammad b. Hindūshāh-i Nakhchivāni.
- Daulatshāh. *The Tadbkirat al-shu ‘ará of Dawlatsháh*. Ed. E. G. Browne. London—Leiden, 1901.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Fāḍil Haravī. *Irshād al-żirā‘a*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār Najm al-Daula. Tehrān, 1323/1905 (Pers. text).
- Falāḥa. *Kitāb-i ‘ilm-i falāḥat u ḥirāt, ta’līf-i shakhs-i ‘ālim va ‘āmil va siyāḥi dar ‘ahd-i Ghāzān Khān*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār Najm al-Daula. Tehrān, 1323/1905 (Pers. text, lithogr.).
- Firdausī. *Şhāh-Nāma*. J. Mohl, *Chah-nama, édition complète*, vol. I–VII. Paris, 1830–78 (texte pers.).
- Grigor of Akner. *History of the Nation of the Archers (Mongols)*... The Armenian text ed. with an English tr. and notes by Robert P. Blake and Richard N. Frye. Cambridge, Mass., 1954.
- Gurgānī, Fakhr al-Dīn. *Vīs u Rāmīn*. Ed. M. Minovi. Tehrān, 1314/1935 (Pers. text).
- Hāfiẓ-i Abrū. Geographical work without title, manuscript of the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek, No. 5361 (Tashkent).
- Dhabīl-i Jāmi‘ al-tawārikh. Ed. Khānbābā Bayānī. Tehrān, 1317/1938.
- Hudūd al-‘ālam*. Manuscript of Tumansky (phototype of the Persian text), with tr. by V. V. Barthold. L., 1930.
- V. Minorsky, *Hudūd al-‘ālam*... London, 1937. G.M.S., n.s. xi (English tr. and commentary).
- Husain Āvī. *Tarjuma-yi Maḥāsin-i Isfahān*. Ed. ‘Abbās Iqbāl. Tehrān, 1328/1949 (Pers. text).
- Ibn al-Aṭhir. *Ibn el-Aṭhīr Chronicon*... Ed. C. J. Tornberg, vol. XII. Leiden-Upsala, 1853–64 (Arab. text).
- Ibn al-Balkhī. *The Fārs-nāma*... Ed. by le Strange and R. Nicholson. London, 1921. G.M.S. n.s. 1 (Pers. text).
- Ibn Baṭṭūta. *Voyages d’Ibn Batoutah*... Par C. Defrémy et le Dr. B. R. Sanguinetti, vol. I–IV. Paris. 1854–9 (texte arabe et traduction française).
- Ibn Funduq, Abū-l-Ḥasan Baihaqī. *Ta’rīkh-i Baihaq*. Ed. Aḥmad Bahmanyār. Tehrān, 1317/1938 (Pers. text).
- Ibn Isfandiyār. *Ta’rīkh-i Ṭabaristān*. Ed. ‘Abbās Iqbāl, vol. I. Tehrān, 1320/1941 (Pers. text).
- *An abridged translation of the History of Tabaristan... by E. G. Browne*. Leiden-London, 1905. G.M.S., II.
- Ibn Rusta. *Kitāb al-a‘lāq an-nafta*... Ed. M. I. de Goeje. B.G.A., vol. VII. Leiden, 1892 (Arab. text).
- Irshād aṣ-ṣirā‘a*. See Fāḍil Haravī.
- Jūzjānī, Minhāj ad-Dīn. *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*. Ed. W. Nassau-Lees. Calcutta, 1863–4 (Pers. text).
- Juvainī, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Aṭā Malik. *The Ta’rīkh-i Jahān-Gushā*... Ed. by Mirzā Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb-i Qazvīnī, parts I–III. London–Leiden, 1912–37. G.M.D., XVI, 1–3 (Pers. text).
- Juvainī (tr. by J. A. Boyle). *The History of the World-Conqueror*, vols. I–II. Manchester, 1958.
- Kāshifī, Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Ali ibn Husayn-i Vā‘iz. *Rasḥabāt ‘ain al-hayāt*. Tashkent 1329/1911 (Pers. text, lithogr.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Khwandamîr. *Habîb al-siyar.* Bombay, 1253/1857 (Pers. text, lithogr.).
- Kirakos Gandzaketsi. M. Brosset, *Deux historiens arméniens... Kirakos de Gandzak...* SPb, 1871 (trad. franç.).
- Kitâb-i ‘ilm-i falâhat u zirâ‘at. See *Falâha*.
- Mar’ashî, Zahir al-Din. *Sehr ed-din’s Geschichte von Tabaristan.* Ed. B. Dorn. SPb, 1850 (Pers. text).
- Mar Yabalaha. *Histoire de Mar Yabalaha III, patriarche des Nestoriens...,* Traduite du syriaque par J. B. Chabot. Paris, 1895 (trad. franç.).
- Muhammad b. Hindûshâh-i Nakhchivâni. *Dastûr al-kâtib fî-tâ‘yîn al-marâtib.* Manuscript of the Institute of the Nations of Asia of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, unnumbered. Copy of V. G. Tischenhausen from the Vienna manuscript F-185 (Leningrad: Pers.).
- Saifi, Saif, ibn Muhammad al-Harâvi. *Saifi, Ta’rikh-Nâma-yi Harât.* Ed. Prof. Muhammad Zubair al-Šiddiqî. Calcutta, 1944 (Pers. text).
- Shabângârai, Muhammed. *Majma‘ al-ansâb.* Manuscript of the Institute of the Nations of Asia, no. 372 (Leningrad: Pers.).
- Shams-i Fakhri. *Shams-i Fachrii Ispahanensis Lexicon Persicum.* Ed. C. Salemann. Kazan, 1887 (Pers. text and indices).
- Tabari, Muhammad ibn Jarîr. *Annales.* Ed. M. J. de Goeje, Ser. I. Leiden, 1879 (Arab. text).
- Th. Noeldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden.* Leiden, 1879.
- Ta’rikh-i Baïhaq.* See Ibn Funduq.
- Ta’rikh-i Sîstân.* Ed. Malik al-Shu‘arâ Bahâr. Tehrân, 1314/1935 (Pers. text).
- Vâssâf. *Kitâb-i tâjziyat al-amṣâr wa tâzjiyat al-a‘sâr.* Bombay, 1269/1852-3 (Pers. text, lithogr.).
- Yâqût ar-Rûmî al-Hamawî. *Jacut’s geographisches Woerterbuch.* Ed. F. Wuestenfeld, Bd. I-IV. Leipzig, 1866-70.

Secondary sources

- Alizade, A. A. *K istorii feodal’níkh otnoshenii v Azerbaidžhane XIII-XIV vv.—termini “tarb” i “gopchûr”.* S.S.I.A., vîp. I. Baku, 1949.
- *K voprosu ob institute ik-tâ‘i v Azerbaidžhane, sbornik statei po istorii Azerbaidžhana* (S.S.A.), vîp. I. Baku, 1949.
- *K voprosu ob institute indzhû v Azerbaidžhane.* S.S.I.A., vîp. I. Baku, 1949.
- *K voprosu o polozhenii krstyan v Azerbaidžhane v X-XIV vv.* Trudi Instituta istorii Akad. Nauk Azerb. SSR, vol. III. Baku, 1949.
- *Sotsial’no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Azerbaidžhana XIII-XIV vv.* Baku, 1956.
- *Zemel’naya politika il’khanov v Azerbaidžhane.* Trudi Instituta istorii Akademii Nauk Azerb. SSR, vol. I. Baku, 1947.
- Barthold, V. V. “Hâfiż-i Abrû i ego sochineniya.” *Sbornik “al-Muzaffariya” v chest’ V. R. Rozena.* SPb, 1897.
- *Istoriko-geografichesky obzor Irana.* SPb, 1903.
- *Istoria kulturnoi zhizni Turkestana.* L., 1927.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barthold, V. V. "K istorii krestyanskikh dvizhenii v Persii." *Sbornik "Iz dalekogo i blizkogo proshlogo v chest' N. I. Kareeva"*. SPb, 1923.
- "K voprosu o feodalizme v Irane." *Novy Vostok*, no. 28. M., 1930.
- *Mesto prikaspiskikh oblastei v istorii muslimanskogo mira*. Baku, 1926.
- *Persidskaya nadpis' na stene aniyorskoi mecheti Manuche*. SPb, 1911.
- "Tadzhik." *E.I.*, vol. IV.
- *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*. London, 1958; G.M.S., n.s. v.
- *Turkestan v epokhu Mongol'skogo nashestvia* (Works, vol. 1). M., 1963 (2nd Russian edn).
- Becker, C. H. "Steuerpacht und Lehnwesen in den moslemischen Staaten." *Der Islam*, vol. v, 1. 1914.
- Belenitsky, A. M. "K voprosu sotsial'nikh otnosheniyakh v Hulaguidskuyu epokhu." *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, vol. v. M.-L., 1948.
- Browne, E. G. *A Literary History of Persia*. vol. III. Cambridge, 1951.
- Cahen, Claude. "L'évolution de l'iqtā' du IX au XIII siècle." *Annales (Economies, Sociales, Civilisation)*, vol. 8, N. 1. Paris, 1953.
- Gordlevsky, V. A. *Gosudarstvo Sel'jukidov Maloi Azii*. M., 1941.
- Heyd, W. *Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter*, Bd. I-II. Stuttgart, 1879.
- Hinz, Walter. "Das Rechnungswesen orientalischer Reichsfinanzämter im Mittelalter." *Der Islam*, Bd. 29/1-2. Berlin, 1949.
- Iqbāl (Eghbāl), 'Abbās. *Tārīkh-i muṣṭafā-i Īrān az istilā-yi Muḡāl tā i'lān-i mashrūtiyyat*, jild-i I. Az Chingīz tā Timūr. Tehrān, 1312/1933.
- Lambton, A. K. S. *Islamic Society in Persia*. London, 1954.
- *Landlord and Peasant in Persia*. London, 1953.
- Le Strange, G. *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*. Cambridge, 1905.
- Minorsky, V. "A civil and military review in Fars in 881/1476." *B.S.O.A.S.*, vol. x, part 1. 1959.
- "A Mongol decree of 720/1320 to the family of Shaykh Zahid." *B.S.O.A.S.*, vol. XVI, part 3. 1954.
- "A Soyurghal of Qasim B. Jahangir Aq-Qoyunlu 903/1498." *B.S.O.A.S.*, vol. ix, part 4. 1939.
- "Pūr-i Bahā and his Poems." *Charisteria* (J. Rypka). Prague, 1956.
- Petrushevsky, I. P. "Feodalnoe khozyaystvo Rashid ad-dina." *Voprosi istorii*, no. 4. 1951.
- "Gorodskaya znat' v gosudarstve Hulaguidov." *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, vol. v. M.-L., 1948.
- "Iz istorii Bukharī v XIII v..." *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosud. universiteta*, no. 179 (Seria vostokovedcheskikh nauk, vypusk 1). L., 1949.
- "Persidskii traktat po agrotekhnike vremeni Gazan-khana." *Materiali pervoi vsesoyuznoi nauchnoi konferentsii vostokovedov* 1957g. Tashkent, 1958.
- "Trud Seifi kak istochnik po istorii Vostochnogo Horasana." *Materiali Yuzhno-Turmenskoi arkheologicheskoi ekspeditsii*, vol. v. Ashkabad, 1955.
- *Zemledelie i agrarnye otnosheniya v Irane XIII-XIV vv.* M.-L., 1960.
- Poliak, A. N. "Classification of lands in the Islamic law." *Amer. Journ. Semitic Lang. Literatures*. 1940.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Poliak, A. N. "La féodalité islamique." *La Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, vol. x.
Paris, 1936.
- Schwarz, P. *Iran im Mittelalter nach den arabischen Geographen*, vols. i-ix.
Leipzig, 1896-1936.
- Spuler, B. *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 2nd ed. Berlin, 1955.
- "Quellenkritik der Mongolengeschichte Irans." *Z.D.M.G.* vol. 92 (17),
1939.

CHAPTER 7

A bibliography of the sources used here and of much other material may be found in the following three works:

- B. Spuler. *Die Mongolen in Iran*. Berlin, 1955 (see especially pp. 167-249).
Z. Safa. *Ta'rikh-i adabiyāt dar Irān*. Vol. II, part I. Tehrān, 1341/1962
(pp. 103-98).

I. P. Petrushevsky. *Zemledelie i agrarnie otnošeniya v Irane XIII-XIV vekov*.
Moscow, Leningrad, 1960 (especially pp. 403-71).

On "Shi'ite" Sūfism, see especially:

M. Molé. "Les Kubrawiya entre sunnisme et shiisme aux huitième et neuvième siècles de l'hégire." *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*. 1961. Pp. 61-142.

On Shi'ism, see also:

R. Strothmann. *Die Zwölfer-Schi'a, Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Charakterbilder aus der Mongolenzeit*. Leipzig, 1926.

CHAPTER 8

ABBREVIATIONS

- B.S.O.A.S. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.
J.A. *Journal Asiatique*.
J.R.A.S. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.
J.S.S. *Journal of Semitic Studies*.
N.D.A.T. *Nashriyya-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tabriz* (Journal of the Tabriz Faculty of Arts).
N.D.A.Te. *Nashriyya-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyāt-i Tibrān* (Journal of the Tehrān Faculty of Arts).
ZDMG *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.

Further details in J. Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature*.

'Abd al-Vāsi' Jabali. *Dīvān*, ed. Dh. Ṣafā. I. (*Qaṣīdas*). Tehrān, 1339/1960-1.
Abdullah, S. M. "The Value of Persian Poetry", in *Islamic Research Association Miscellany*, vol. I. Oxford, 1949.

Adib Ṣābir. *Dīvān*, ed. 'Alī Qavīm. 1334/1955-6.

'Am'aq. *Dīvān*, ed. S. Nafīsī. Tehrān, 1339/1960-1.

Anṣārī. "Munājāt", transl. A. J. Arberry. *Islamic Culture*, 1936, pp. h 369-80.
Anvari. *Dīvān*, ed. S. Nafīsī. Tehrān, 1337/1958-9; 2 vols., ed. Muh. T.

Mudarris Rażāvī. Tehrān, 1337/1958-9, 1340/1961-2./V. A. Zhukovskiy, *Ali Ankhadreddin Enveri. Materiali dlya ego biografii i kharakteristiki*. St Petersburg, 1883.